HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS IN CANADIAN SCHOOL BOARDS

HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS IN CANADIAN SCHOOL BOARDS

Canadian Education Association/
Association canadienne d'éducation
Suite 8-200, 252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Ontario M5S1V5

91-02538/

The Canadian Education Association pursues the improvement of education and serves the education community by providing opportunities to study issues of common interest; to share ideas, experiences and information; to establish and maintain linkages with government bodies, non-government agencies and individuals; to analyze trends and directions through research; and to participate in learning activities.

© Canadian Education Association/
Association canadienne d'éducation
Suite 8-200, 252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V5

ISBN: 0-920315-46-1

1991

Ce texte est également disponible en français sous le titre : ***Les programmes d'enseignement des langues d'origine dans les commissions scolaires canadiennes***

Printed in Canada

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	**1**
Definition of Heritage Language	**5**
PROVINCIAL POLICIES AND LEGISLATION	**5**
Northwest Territories	**5**
Newfoundland and Labrador	**5**
Prince Edward Island	**6**
Nova Scotia	**6**
New Brunswick	**6**
Quebec	**6**
Ontario	**8**
Manitoba	**9**
Saskatchewan	**13**
Alberta	**14**
British Columbia	**17**
PROGRAMS	
Quebec	**19**
Ontario	**24**
Manitoba	**33**
Saskatchewan	**37**
Alberta	**40**
TEACHER TRAINING IN HERITAGE LANGUAGES	
University of Manitoba	**44**
University of Saskatchewan	**45**
University of British Columbia	**46**
Some Textbooks Used	**46**
CONCLUSION	**47**
APPENDICES	**49**
Appendix A	
List of Responding School Boards	**51**

Appendix B
Burnaby School District
Position Paper on Languages 54

Appendix C
Seven Oaks School Division No. 10
Heritage Language Programs 56
Extra-curricular Yiddish Program 58

Appendix D
The Winnipeg School Division No. 1
Heritage Language Review
Evaluation Report: Executive Summary 60

Appendix E
Peel Board of Education
Heritage Language Liaison Information 63

INTRODUCTION

DURING THE LAST 15 to 20 years, the number of children coming from homes where the first language spoken is neither French nor English has increased at a phenomenal rate. In some areas of Metropolitan Toronto, the number of children requiring English as a Second Language classes has grown to 50%, causing enormous concerns for the provision of ESL classes, but also giving rise to numerous questions and points of view on the advisability of providing heritage language classes. Simply put, the question is this: should our schools, in addition to teaching English and French, be teaching a third language, in most cases the language spoken by the parents or other family members? What appears at first glance to be a simple question has, in fact, turned out to be a highly contentious one. On the social and political levels, the debate continues on the advisability of maintaining multiculturalism: should Canada encourage its recent arrivals to maintain their own identity, language and culture? is there value in diversity? or should we adopt the way of the United States, encouraging all to blend into the "melting pot"?

Besides the more obvious government departments involved, such as Canada Employment and Immigration, the federal Secretary of State and its Multiculturalism offices, and provincial ministries or departments of citizenship, we also get involved in a debate on the role of the schools in assimilating or maintaining other languages and cultures. For the first half of this century, the prevailing attitude generally was assimilation, or Canadianization: children were encouraged to leave ethnic at home and to learn English and Canadian social manners to get ahead. Bilingualism was seen as a detriment, causing confusion in children's thinking. This was based on the premise that there was only so much room in a child's brain for language, and that too much of one language would crowd out another. We read of many cases where parents were encouraged by teachers to abandon the use of the first (or "foreign") language to speak only English, so as not to confuse the child! (We can imagine the disruption in family communications this must have caused.) However, research done at this time showed that bilingual children frequently did poorly at school, and experienced

many emotional and familial conflicts, as they were made to feel that the home culture should be rejected in favour of all things Canadian.

Modern research has, for many,[1] indicated the contrary, i.e., that children can learn many languages, that learning one language does not crowd out another, but rather leads to increased facility in others.

Also surfacing in recent years is the belief that preserving one's ethnic identity is a desirable aspect of our society. Yet the old attitudes prevail in some sectors of our society, and many people still advocate the "melting pot" approach. Those in favour of encouraging multiculturalism today find themselves accused of supporting "ghettoization", as others accuse them of giving in to "ethnic demands." Educators opting for the teaching of heritage language are finding themselves swamped in cries of "schools are over-burdened enough with phys ed, computers, and AIDS," "back to the basics," "teach them to read, write and speak English," and "loss of time for the core curriculum."

The other side of the argument, espoused by those in favour of multiple language learning, is backed up by researchers who maintain that preservation of one's first or "heritage" language leads to a greater self-esteem, pride in one's origins, family harmony, and an increased tolerance of all groups in the Canadian mosaic, all of which indicate to many that heritage language development should be considered an educational and social priority.

The debate is endless: the ability to learn two languages is seen as desirable; witness the numbers of middle-class parents putting their children in French immersion. Europeans know several languages, thus it would appear that Canadians can learn several languages, even that it would be desirable.

Some claim it is all a matter of terminology. We read with interest reports of a study done by Jim Cummins and Marcel Danesi: they asked parents if they would enrol their children in a particular program, calling it alternately "language arts" or "heritage language." Even though that was the sole variable, the majority chose the description of the program reading "language arts."

Taxpayers mount protests and pen letters to the editor about the escalating property taxes they are asked to pay to finance what they believe to be "optional" or "unnecessary" programs.

School administrators face new problems in programming and staffing, and in supervising instructors who speak languages they do not understand.

Jim Cummins and Marcel Danesi raise the issue of racism and its relevance to the issue of heritage languages.[2] "The current rhetoric of multiculturalism, however, is frequently at variance with the continuing underground reality of Anglo-conformity. Given the relative recency of an official multiculturalism policy and the strong Anglo-conformity tradition that preceded it, it is hardly surprising that assimilationist orientations are still prominent in many Canadian institutions, including schools. Michael Valpy (1979) notes that in public opinion polls a majority of Canadians has always responded affirmatively when asked whether Canada accepts too many immigrants, and currently public anxiety about immigration and racism is at its highest point in Canadian polling history." They note with some optimism, however, that the government is acknowledging racism and has established Employment Equity, the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, and departments for Canadian multiculturalism and citizenship.

---

1. See the work of J. Cummins, M. Danesi, S. Lapkin, M. Swain, etc.
2. Jim Cummins, and Marcel Danesi, "Lifting the Multicultural Veil," in *Heritage Languages*, a special number of *Our Schools/Our Selves* February 1990 p. 13.

Danesi and Cummins, in the same article, sum up part of the objections raised to the provision of heritage language programs: "Commentators typically have no objection to communities teaching heritage languages quietly in their own homes or community schools, but they object strenuously to heritage language teaching being institutionalized within the public school system and supported by public monies."

The Canadian Education Association, conscious of the controversy persisting into the 1990s over heritage language programs, set out to sample the school boards across Canada to see what (if any) programs they offer, how they schedule them, who teaches, who pays for the bus, what the advantages are, what the disadvantages are, etc. A survey of provincial legislation, regulations, policy, programs, and funding supportive of heritage language instruction in the schools in Canada in 1990 begins the report. The second part is a province by province review of local programs. An overview of the programs available to teachers at faculties of education concludes the report.

DEFINITION OF HERITAGE LANGUAGE

The language of origin, the first language, the language of one's parents or one's ancestors, the ethnic or minority language has commonly been called a "Heritage Language." Yet we find ourselves in some difficulty trying to define heritage language: we have seen much use made of the definition established by the Ontario Ministry of Education, that is, "any language other than French or English." There is, however, the definition used by Jim Cummins and Marcel Danesi, in a footnote to their article cited above. We reproduce this in its entirety:

> *The term "heritage language" usually refers to all languages other than the aboriginal languages of Native and Inuit peoples and the "official" Canadian languages (English and French). A variety of other terms have been used in Canada to refer to heritage languages: for example, "ethnic," "minority," "ancestral," "third," and "non-official" have all been used at different times and in different provinces. The term used in Quebec is "langues d'origine." In other countries the term "community languages" is used (e.g., Australia, Britain, New Zealand) and the term "mother-tongue teaching" is also common. A number of Canadian proponents of heritage language teaching have expressed misgivings about the term because it connotes learning about past traditions rather than acquiring language skills that have significance for children's overall educational and personal development. In the Toronto Board of Education the term "modern languages" is used partly in an attempt to defuse the strong emotional reactions that the term "heritage languages" evokes.* [3]

The CEA survey asked for languages other than French, English and aboriginal, partly in response to Cummins and Danesi, partly out of the knowledge that CEA is planning a more comprehensive study of Native Education, which will include the teaching of native languages. Some boards did, however, provide us with information on native language programs: we reproduce the material here, and will explore it later in more detail.

---

3. *Ibid.*

School Boards Responding to the Heritage Language Questionnaire

	Sent	Replies	%	Programs	Guidelines
Northwest Territories	1	1	100	0	0
Newfoundland	5	4	80	0	0
Prince Edward Island	4	4	100	0	0
Nova Scotia	5	5	100	0	0
New Brunswick	13	10	77	0	0
Québec	13	11	85	4	2
Ontario	28	23	82	19	4
Manitoba	11	7	64	4	2
Saskatchewan	11	8	73	3	0
Alberta	20	12	60	4	3
British Columbia	12	9	75	0	1
TOTAL	124	94		34	12

Barbara Gough
Information Officer

PROVINCIAL POLICIES AND LEGISLATION

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES Department of Education does not offer any Heritage Language Programs, other than instruction in the Native languages.

The only school board surveyed in the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife Education District #1, does not offer any programs in heritage languages, but says that there will be increased demand in this area because, as of the spring of 1990, the Northwest Territories has recognized Native or aboriginal languages as official languages.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

The Department of Education says that Native languages are part of the regular school curriculum for Innu and Innuit students in Labrador.

Innu (also known as Montagnais-Naskapi) is taught as a k-3 immersion program and as k-9 heritage language program with the Labrador Roman Catholic School Board. The Labrador East Integrated School Board offers Innuit programs (the language taught is Inuktitut) as part of their k-3 immersion program and k-senior high language program. Funding is provided through a federal/provincial agreement.

The Department of Education is in the process of developing a multicultural policy and, as a result, will be examining the heritage language issue more closely.

Four school boards in Newfoundland and Labrador responded to the survey. None of them currently offers any heritage language programs. Labrador East Integrated School Board in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador, might offer one in the future, because the "location adjacent to the Goose Bay military base might necessitate language teaching in Dutch or German, depending on the numbers involved."

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

The province of Prince Edward Island does not offer any programs in heritage languages.

Of the four responding school boards from Prince Edward Island, none offers programs in heritage languages.

NOVA SCOTIA

Nova Scotia is not involved in the delivery of non-credit courses in heritage languages. Those courses that are available are offered outside school hours, usually through the initiative of parents interested in having instruction in a particular language offered to their children. In the past, such instruction was funded through grants from the Secretary of State but groups have, in recent months, been advised that financial assistance for non-credit heritage language courses is to be discontinued.

None of the five school boards responding to the CEA survey offer programs in heritage languages.

NEW BRUNSWICK

No non-credit courses in heritage languages are offered in the public schools of New Brunswick. Provincial legislation and regulations allow - but do not require - the organization of a heritage language class in a public school. This would require the consent of the local school board. There is no funding provided for such classes nor for teachers' professional development.

Of the ten school boards responding from New Brunswick, none offered programs in Heritage Languages. All ten boards responding said that no program had ever been requested by their communities, and, with one exception, that none was being contemplated. The primary reason cited was the very low immigration rate of non-English and non-French, and hence the very minor portion of the population who may speak a language other than French or English or a native language. One board felt that, in their very small community, citizens of other origins preferred to integrate either into the French- or the English-speaking communities. Only one board, School District No. 25 in Oromocto, indicated that they are investigating the possibility of classes in Maliseet, the native Indian language of the area.

QUEBEC

Legislation

Bill 101, which was adopted in 1977, imposes the use of French as the language of instruction, except for certain specific conditions under the *French language charter (chapter C-11, section 73, (a), (b), (c), (d))*, where English is to be the language of instruction.

In 1978, the Quebec Ministry of Education, conscious of the problems that the children of immigrants face in their integration to Quebec society, launched "le Programme d'enseignement des langues d'origine (PELO)." At the outset, this program was intended for active or passive speakers of the target language. Since 1989, this

instruction may be extended to all the pupils of a school where the PELO is in operation, with certain conditions:

- the number of pupils who are not native speakers of the language must not be greater than 50% of the number of pupils of that ancestry, at whom this instruction is initially aimed;

- a pupil may enrol in only one heritage language course.

Programs

The only heritage language programs funded are those for which provincial curricula approved by the Quebec Ministry of Education exist. At the outset, the ministry, with the assistance of the cultural communities, undertook the development of four programs of study at the primary level, including related curriculum guides, for Greek, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish. Subsequently, the ministry gave the responsibility for curriculum development to the school boards wishing to offer other language courses. Thus programs were developed locally for Vietnamese, Cambodian, Chinese, Lao, Arabic, Hebrew, Creole and Algonquin.

Pupils

The Quebec heritage language program (PELO) has grown tremendously from 26 pupils in 1978-79 to 5,886 pupils in 1989-90. Currently 72 schools offer the program, in four regional divisions and in 10 school commissions. In order of size, the Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal has 60% of the pupils, Jérôme - LeRoyer has 25%, the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal has 7% and Sainte-Croix has 4%. The six remaining school commissions, Greenfield Park, les Ecores, Baldwin-Cartier, Brossard, Harricana and Laurentian, have the remaining 4%. By far the majority of pupils are at the primary level.

Scheduling

The individual school commission determines the time and the space reserved for heritage language programs. In general, these courses are offered daily, for a total of 150 minutes per week. They are only rarely integrated into the regular school day, being offered instead over the lunch hour or before or after regular school hours.

Funding

The Quebec Ministry of Education offers financial support to school commissions that offer these courses by paying for the salaries of teachers and for teaching materials. Support is also provided through professional development workshops for teachers, offered at the request of the regional divisions. They also furnish assistance with the implementation of the curriculum.

Programme des langues ethniques

There exists in Quebec a program whereby the ethnic communities themselves teach the heritage languages, as opposed to the PELO where they are taught by the publicly funded schools. The Programme des langues ethniques (PLE), which has been in existence since 1970, consists of financial support administered through

the Quebec Ministry of Cultural Communities and Immigration. It provides assistance for the teaching of heritage languages by the ethnic communities themselves, outside the regular publicly funded school system. (Classes are usually on Saturday mornings or after the regular school day.) Grant subsidies are available to rent approved classroom space from the boards of education. Some conditions apply: recipients must be non-profit groups, they must be incorporated under Quebec law, and they must meet the requirements of the *Private Education Act*. Evaluation requirements for these grants include the conformity of the heritage language instruction with the clearly identified needs of the target community, and the ability of the organization to ensure that the program management and instruction are compatible with the expectations of the Ministry of Cultural Communities and Immigration, and with those of the Ministry of Education. Also considered are the enrolment statistics, the community support for the program, the absence of duplication of program, and the involvement of volunteers. Over 19,000 students from 35 language groups are involved in these classes, as of 1990. The Quebec government funding covers about 10% of the total operating costs of these supplementary classes, and the ethnocultural communities themselves provide 76% of the operating funds. Unlike the PELO courses, the parents must pay tuition fees. Nevertheless, the numbers have steadily increased over the years.

Of the 11 school boards in Quebec responding to the CEA survey, seven offered programs in heritage languages, and four did not.

ONTARIO

Leyislation

Ontario Regulation 154 (Part II) requires school boards and minority language sections to provide instruction in a language other than English or French when written requests are received from parents on behalf of 25 or more qualified persons of that school board or minority language section. Students enrolled or eligible to be enrolled in the primary, junior or the first two years of the intermediate division of a school board or minority language section may enrol in languages (Heritage Language Program) other than English or French.

Under the Ontario Heritage Languages Program, language classes are offered after school, on a non-school day or, where enrolments justify, the five-hour school day is extended by 30 minutes. Students may enrol in more than one heritage language class; however, a student shall not receive more than 2 1/2 hours of instruction per week in any one language or no more than 2 1/2 hours per day, in the case of the summer school classes.

School boards and minority language sections accept full responsibility for the staff, curriculum and supervision of the heritage language classes. Classes may be offered in a location other than a school site, after the end of an instructional day. However, a sufficient interval of time must be allowed to enable students to travel to the location before the class begins. This ensures accessibility to the program for students who wish to enrol in the particular language class.

When classes are established for the first time, the commencement date shall be the last school day in September or January, provided that written requests have been received 90 days or more prior to the commencement date. Once established, the class or program shall continue for the balance of the school year so long as one person is in attendance.

Funding

The Ontario Ministry of Education funds the Heritage Languages Program as part of the Continuing Education Grants (as outlined in the General Legislative Grants) to school boards and minority language sections operating heritage language classes. An hourly grant (maximum 2 1/2 hours per week per language), based on an average class enrolment of 25 students, is received. Grants allocated for the Heritage Languages Program cover the cost of the program. School boards and minority language sections allocate funds to the Heritage Languages Program for developing materials and for the professional development of the instructors. It is, however, the responsibility of the parents or guardians to transport the child to the language class.

Program

In *A Proposal for Action, Ontario's Heritage Languages Program* (1987) five initiatives to be undertaken by the Ministry of Education to enhance the delivery and implementation of the Heritage Languages Program were identified.

The Ontario Heritage Languages Program has current enrolments of over 96,000 students. Sixty-eight school boards and minority language sections provide more than 4,500 heritage language classes in 62 different languages.

Five school boards provide a number of heritage language classes as part of the extended school day. The Metropolitan Separate School Board (Toronto) provides heritage language instruction, on the extended school day model, to approximately 22,000 students. York Region R.C.S.S.B., Dufferin-Peel R.C.S.S.B., Hamilton-Wentworth R.C.S.S.B., and the Toronto Board of Education also use the extended school day model.

The greatest concentration of languages taught and enrolments is in the Central Ontario region. Italian, Portuguese and Cantonese languages account for approximately 50% of the total enrolments of the Heritage Languages Program.

It is interesting to note that approximately 10% of the students enrolled in the program are of a different ethnic background from the language being studied.

In Ontario, 23 boards responded to the CEA survey, of which 19 offer programs, and four do not.

MANITOBA

Legislation

Use of other languages

79 (2) When authorized by the school board, a language other than English or French may be used in any school in the school division or district

(a) for instruction in religion during a period authorized for such instruction;

(b) during a period authorized by the minister for teaching the language;

(c) before and after the regular school hours prescribed in the regulations and applicable to that school;

(d) in compliance with the regulations as a language of instruction, for transitional purposes;
(e) in compliance with the regulations, as a language of instruction for not more than 50% of the regular school hours as determined by the minister.

R.S.M. 1987 Supp., c. 26, s. 7.

Funding

Heritage language support is provided in the following categories: Bilingual - full-time equivalent student x $250; Basic - full-time equivalent student x $100.

To receive funding for bilingual heritage language programs, divisions must provide 50% of instruction time in the heritage language. To receive funding for basic heritage language programs, divisions must teach the heritage language for at least 30 minutes a day, five days out of six. Native language instruction is funded using the same formula.

The grant calculation is based on student lists submitted by school divisions indicating actual enrolment in bilingual, heritage and Native language classes as of September 30th each year.

Program

In 1989, approximately 17,400 Manitoban students were enrolled in Native and other non-official language programs. Of this number, 6,000 students in core heritage language programs, 2,500 in Native language programs and 1,975 in bilingual heritage language programs, received language instruction as part of the normal school day. In addition, 5,300 students in supplementary schools and a further 1,600 students in Hutterite schools received language instruction in after-school or week-end programs.

Enrolment in the bilingual program in 1989 was as follows: Ukrainian/English (k-9) - 971; English/German (k-8) - 692; English/Hebrew - 312.

Enrolment in the core language program in 1984 was as follows: German - 5,400; Chinese - 91; and fewer than 50 students in Italian, Polish, Hebrew, Tagalog, Punjabi, Yiddish, Portugese, Hindi and Greek.

Enrolment in Native languages was 2,500 in 54 schools: instruction was given in Cree, Ojibwe/Saulteaux, Island Lake Cree, Dakota/Sioux, Dene/Chipewyan.

The supplementary schools with an enrolment of 5,300 students offered instruction in 26 different languages.

Supports

Transportation: Students enrolled in public school language programs were eligible for transportation as part of division policy on transportation. Students in supplementary schools and private schools do not qualify for transportation.

Professional development: Teachers in all schools have equal access to professional development sessions and Manitoba Education and Training provides consultant services, curriculum development and implementation support for language programs offered as part of the school day.

Policy and Practices

The *Administrative Handbook for Manitoba Schools* (1988) on "Culture and Language" states (1.2.04):

> *The broad goals of public education stress the developmental needs of students. Multicultural education is the process of making education more responsive to the cultural and linguistic diversity that characterizes our society. Its place within a core curriculum acknowledges the need to prepare all students to live in a multicultural society. Integral to the school program in its entirety, therefore, are objectives that seek to recognize and understand the many forms that culture takes, to assist students to develop and retain a personal identity through an awareness of their own cultural and historical heritages, and to develop an understanding of and respect for the cultural and historical heritages of others. Integral also is the provision of opportunities under the law and through the school curriculum to provide instruction in both English and French language, being the official languages recognized under the British North America Act, and in heritage languages, and to provide for the study of second languages by offering language options, in various forms, as part of the school program.*

The *Public School Act* was amended in 1981 to include a "Language of Study" component. The requirements for implementing core language of study programs are outlined below, as summarized here by The Winnipeg School Division No. 1, in the October 1989 *Heritage Language Review Evaluation Report:*

Language of study programs may be offered by a school in Grades K-12 inclusive with the following provisions:

1. *That the program has sufficient enrolment, generally 25 in elementary grades, and 18 in secondary grades.*
2. *That a qualified teacher is available.*
3. *That an approved language of study program is available or, if a program is being introduced for which no curriculum is available, a proposal and a course of study have been submitted by a school board for a division or district and duly approved by the minister in the form and manner set out in the Act.*
4. *That textbooks and supplementary materials have been authorized or approved by the minister.*

Time allotments for a "language of study" other than English shall not exceed the time allotments allocated to other languages of study authorized by the minister and set down in curriculum guides issued under the authority of the minister. Recommended time allotments for K-6 are 20-40 minutes daily/100 minutes weekly.

In practice, the responsibility for curriculum implementation and development and the provision of appropriate resources is shared between the school division and Manitoba Education. The students and an ongoing commitment to a heritage language program come from the community; the teachers and facilities come from the school division; and the program and support services come from Manitoba Education.

The responsibilities of Manitoba Education include:

- *identifying goals and objectives at particular grade levels*
- *developing curricula and providing program supports*
- *identifying approved textbooks and other suitable material*
- *providing the necessary resources to support curricula develop-*

ment and implementation, and to develop and/or purchase textbooks and materials where necessary

- *planning pre-service and in-service training and orientation sessions for teachers hired to teach the courses*
- *providing consultative service for all schools and teachers, including advice and assistance in monitoring and evaluating the entire program*

The School Division is responsible for:

- *developing policies and procedures for implementation of programs and ensuring access to them for all students*
- *hiring qualified teachers to teach the program*
- *planning and organizing teacher in-services*
- *providing the necessary resources to support curriculum development, implementation and maintenance, including the purchase of textbooks and other necessary teaching materials.*

Goals and Objectives

There is a great deal of similarity among the goals and objectives of the provincial curricula for heritage language in Manitoba.

The goals have been summarized in The Winnipeg School Division No. 1 *Heritage Language Review Evaluation Report* as follows:

1. *To develop language skills which include listening, speaking, reading and writing in the heritage language.*
2. *To foster an understanding of the culture, traditions and values for the target cultural group within the Canadian context.*
3. *To encourage students to be receptive to other languages and cultures.*

The general objectives have also been summarized in the Winnipeg report:

1. *To listen and understand the Heritage Language in everyday situations in the scope of the material covered.*
2. *To develop oral fluency in the Heritage Language and be able to express basic thoughts, feelings, and needs of oneself and others.*
3. *To be able to read, interpret, and appreciate material written in the Heritage Language.*
4. *To acquire competence in expressing experiences, thoughts and feelings with clarity and sensitivity using correct grammar and spelling.*
5. *To develop awareness, respect and pride of the heritage cultural values, customs, traditions, folklore, literature, and art.*

A total of seven school boards from Manitoba replied to the CEA survey; four offer programs and three do not.

SASKATCHEWAN

Legislation

Saskatchewan's legislation was amended in 1974 to allow teaching in other languages at the request of the community.

Section 180 of the *Education Act* states:

> *(2) subject to the regulations, where a board of education passes a resolution to that effect, a language other than English shall be used as a language of instruction in specified schools in its jurisdiction.*

The Regulations (1986) elaborate further:

> *Section 44 states: . . . a board of education or the governing body of a private school may, by resolution, approve the use of a language other than English as a language of instruction in any specified school in its jurisdiction to a maximum of 100% of the instructional time at the kindergarten level and to a maximum of 50% of the instructional time at other grades.*
>
> *Section 45 states: Where a language other than English has been authorized as a language of instruction pursuant to section 40 or 44, approved English language courses of study are to be provided in grades beginning no later than Grade 3.*

Programs

Saskatchewan Education offers many programs in Indian languages through its Community Education Branch. A provincial curriculum has been developed for teaching Cree to grades 1 - 3. A locally developed course is used in grades 4 - 12 Cree. Locally developed courses are also used to teach Dene and Anishinabeg (Saulteaux).

Provincial curricula exist for German and Ukrainian as a second language, and the Saskatchewan Government Correspondence School offers high school (grades 9 to 12) German and Ukrainian credit courses. A Ukrainian-English bilingual program is offered in Saskatoon. The Department has also approved locally developed courses for Mandarin and Japanese.

In addition to these in-school programs, 25 heritage languages are being taught out of regular school hours. These non-credit programs had been funded by the provincial Department of Culture, Multiculturalism and Recreation. They are now being transferred to Saskatchewan Education as recommended in the *Task Force Report on Multiculturalism* (1989).

The Minister of Education has established the Heritage Language Liaison/ Reference Committee which will advise on the response to two reports, the *Task Force Report on Multiculturalism* (1989) and the *Report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Heritage Languages* (1986).

In response to the recommendations of these reports, the Department intends to move toward granting credit recognition for out-of-school heritage language programs at the secondary level (grades 10, 11 and 12).

Funding

Funding from Saskatchewan Education to school boards through a per pupil grant is made available under section 46 of the Regulations, which states:

> *46 (1) In the calculation of the grant paid to any board of education or private school, the minister shall, subject to these regulations, recognize approved implementation and incremental costs associated with:*
> *(a) any additional requirements in the program for which a language other than English has been authorized pursuant to section 45, and:*
> *(b) any additional requirements of a designated program.*
>
> *46 (2) If a pupil is enrolled in a designated program in a designated school located outside the attendance area of the school he would otherwise be eligible to attend, the minister, in the calculation of grant payments, shall recognize the approved costs of travel and accommodation incurred by that pupil.*

The 1990 grants range from $213 to $492 per pupil, prorated according to the percentage of instructional time in that language. An implementation per pupil grant ranges from $43 to $189. Travel costs are currently recognized at $1.90 per pupil for part-time transportation.

Out-of-school heritage language classes have been funded by the Department of Culture, Multiculturalism and Recreation. Grants are $40 per pupil for the first 20 pupils, $30 per pupil for the next 20 and $20 per pupil for the balance, to a maximum of $2,040. Summer school immersion programs are funded to a maximum of $4,000.

Eight Saskatchewan school boards responded to the survey: three offered programs, five did not.

ALBERTA

Legislation

The *School Act* acknowledges the multicultural nature of Alberta, guarantees English language education for all youngsters, guarantees French language education for students whose parents qualify under Section 23 of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, and allows for the use of French and any heritage language as a language of instruction. The *School Act* refers to these latter programs as alternative programs, which boards may offer if there is sufficient demand. It also indicates that the board may charge fees for non-instructional costs incurred in offering alternative programs that are in addition to costs incurred by the board in providing its regular program.

Another section of the *School Act* with implications for heritage and international languages is "School Councils." Parents may establish a school council for their children's school and advise the principal of the school and the board on any matter relating to the school. The board may enter into agreement with a person or joint committee relative to the provision of educational, managerial or other services. To illustrate, a school board could contract a person or agency to provide language instruction in one or more schools. A board may employ a competent individual to teach a language or culture under the supervision of a teacher who holds a certificate

of qualification issued under the *Department of Education Act*. A school board may develop, for example, language courses to meet particular community needs.

Policy

The Language Education Policy of Alberta provides opportunities for students to learn a range of languages in addition to English or French, respecting the cultural diversity and heritage of Alberta and the desire of many parents who wish their children to learn heritage languages.

Alberta Education supports the provision of opportunities for students who wish to acquire or maintain languages other than English or French so that they may have access to a partial immersion (bilingual) program or second language courses in languages other than English or French.

Current Programs

Alberta offers heritage language, locally developed courses, and bilingual programs. Heritage language courses refer to courses in which a language other than English or French is taught as a subject often between 20 to 40 minutes a day in order that students may develop communication skills and cultural understanding in the language.

Provincial curricula in heritage language courses are available for junior high (grades 7 to 9) in German and Ukrainian and at senior high school (grades 10 to 12) in German, Italian, Spanish and Ukrainian.

Partial immersion (bilingual) programs refer to programs in which a language other than English or French is used as the language of instruction for at least 25% of the instructional day to a maximum of 50%. The province has developed a Ukrainian language arts program (k-12) for the Ukrainian bilingual program. At the local level, bilingual programs are available in Arabic, German, Hebrew/Yiddish, Mandarin and Polish.

Student Enrolments

For the 1989-90 school year, student enrolments in bilingual programs, offered in six languages, totalled 3,004, and enrolments in heritage language courses, offering nine languages, totalled 3,754 students.

In addition, in 1988-89, Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism and the Secretary of State jointly supported 141 heritage language schools offering instruction to 10,806 students outside of school hours, in 41 different languages.

Funding

In Alberta, school jurisdictions receive a basic instruction grant (1990-91 figures) for each student of $1,958 at elementary school, $2,106 at junior high school and $2,272 at senior high school. In addition, school boards offering bilingual programs in languages other than English or French receive $131 per student served (1990-91 figures). No special needs grants are provided for school boards offering heritage language courses.

Language development grants are available for teachers. In accordance with Student Finance Regulations, Section 17, grants are made available for the professional development of languages other than English or French. Eligibility requirements include:

1. The applicant must be a teacher of a language other than English or French from Early Childhood Services to the end of grade 12. This includes teacher aides who are employed as instructors of a language program as per Section 74(2) of the *School Act*.

2. The applicant must have successfully completed a credited course (or courses), workshop or seminar relating to language instruction, which enhances language proficiency.

A rural language transportation grant of $341 per pupil per year is available for eligible passengers who are enrolled in a language program and for whom transportation on existing bus routes or extensions of regular bus routes is not reasonable. The urban transportation of $266 per student is intended to facilitate the transportation of alternative program students such as language students.

Current Initiatives

The following are current initiatives related to heritage language education:

1. Framework to guide local development of language arts curricula for bilingual program.

The *School Act* allows any language to be used as the language of instruction for up to 50% of the school day. As a result of this permissive legislation, six bilingual (partial immersion) programs have been established.

All curriculum and learning resource development for five of these programs has been done locally. Alberta Education has only been involved in the Ukrainian program since that program was initiated with 100 students in grade one.

The locally developed programs are concentrated in elementary classes. The curriculum development is not subject to approval by Alberta Education. The resources used are reviewed and approved at the board level.

To assure minimal provincial standards in bilingual education program development, Alberta Education is developing a framework for the local development of language arts curricula for instruction in languages other than English or French.

2. Revision of Ukrainian Language Arts (K-12) Program

The Review of Secondary Education of the Ukrainian Language Program in 1986 recommended that the Ukrainian Language Program be revised from grades 1-12 to ensure that the developmental needs of students be addressed and that there be program continuity from grades 1 to 12. The review also identified the need for a basic resource to complement the program at all levels. A proposal for the revision of the program was approved in June 1987, and work is in progress. Current status can be summarized thus:

1. Comparison of the current Ukrainian Language Program with French language art is complete.
2. The philosophy of Ukrainian language arts (1-12) is developed.
3. Outcomes, expectations and indicators for Ukrainian language arts at the grade 3, 6, 9 and 12 levels have been developed in co-operation with Edmonton Public School Board.

3. Ukrainian Language Arts (K-12) Resource Project

The 1986 revision of the Ukrainian Language Program also identified the need for a basic resource to complement the program at all levels.

In response to the recommendations of the Review of Secondary Education of the Ukrainian Language Program, the *Proposal for the Revision of Ukrainian Language Arts* approved in June of 1987 included the stipulation that the revision would be co-ordinated with the development of basic resources as needed. To this end, an interagency resource project has been initiated by Alberta Education, ACCESS NETWORK and the Ukrainian Language Education Centre, University of Alberta.

4. Heritage and International Language Courses

Considerable interest in Pacific Rim languages has been registered by a number of school jurisdictions, including the four urban boards in both Edmonton and Calgary, in Red Deer, Rocky Mountain House, Jasper, Leduc, Caroline, Winfield and Breton.

German as a second language programs were reviewed in light of a proficiency-based curricular model. The outcome was the identification of the nature of revision required to make the programs conducive to the development of communicative proficiency.

Activity is underway to establish a Ukraine/Alberta Educational Exchange. The Exchange Program would allow for the exchange of teachers, curriculum developers, administrators, and students studying Ukrainian as a second language.

A discussion paper has been completed to map alternative design and implementation strategies for heritage and international languages.

5. Curricular guidelines and procedures for locally developed language and culture programs

A draft document titled *Curricular Guidelines and Procedures for Locally Developed Language and Cultures Programs* has been developed to assist both private and public schools in the development of language courses. With the growth in enrolments in private ethno-cultural schools and increasing awareness of language maintenance and cultural development among the general public, Alberta Education has been requested to approve language programs developed locally.

Of the 13 Alberta school boards responding to the CEA survey on heritage languages, four offered programs and nine did not.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Legislation

Language of Instruction Every student is entitled to receive an educational program that is provided in the English language. The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations respecting the provision of educational programs in languages other than English.

Policy

The B.C. Ministry of Education is currently developing heritage language

guidelines for the primary and early intermediate years, and will begin to allocate money to school districts for pilot projects. Beginning in April 1991, they will assist school district curriculum committees in developing heritage language pilots. They will assist with pilot programs, and develop a plan to evaluate them. They will also establish a network for providing heritage languages district in-service.

British Columbia school personnel will review guidelines, develop pilots, and assist with and evaluate pilots. School boards and district officials will develop timelines for school and district activities, review guidelines, develop pilots and apply for resources, provide assistance to pilots, and evaluate pilots. Provincial organizations will plan and actively assist delivery of programs at local and provincial levels.

For British Columbia, it is important to note the distinction between language programs supported by the Ministry of Education (school-based) and programs supported by the Ministry of Provincial Secretary (community-based.) The Ministry of Education language programs fall within the mandates of either the Modern Languages and Multicultural Programs Branch or the Native Education Branch. The Ministry of Education is currently developing a definition for "Heritage Languages."

Mandarin, Chinese and Japanese are authorized from grades 9 to 12 inclusive. A proposal is being considered to have those languages available at grades 4 to 7 (inclusive). In September 1990, $2,000 per class was made available for kindergarten to grade 12. This funding does not constitute part of the block funding formula. Professional development for teachers is supported through specialized workshops, grants to Simon Fraser University for methodology courses, grants to cover teacher bursaries, and grants to support conferences sponsored by the British Columbia Association of Modern Language Teachers.

Student bilingual summer school programs are also supported through the University of British Columbia.

The Ministry of Provincial Secretary supports community-based heritage language programs. There is enabling legislation (an Order-in-Council) to support the creation of a Cultural Heritage Advisory Committee. Recently, $250,000 was made available in grants to support heritage language instruction and training outside regular educational channels. This financial assistance is to be used for teaching aids (charts, posters, maps, textbooks, audio-visual materials) and professional development only. The amount of the grant was based on student enrolment figures as follows: 25 students or fewer - $500; 26 to 50 students - $900; 51 to 100 students - $1,500; over 100 students - $2,000.

Of the eight British Columbia school boards responding to our survey, none offered heritage language programs. However, Burnaby School District No. 41 co-sponsors programs with the Heritage Language Association and the Multicultural Society. Burnaby also feels that they will be expanding this service and that it will undoubtedly become part of the program in the future. Burnaby also has a School District Position Paper on Languages (See Appendix B), which treats heritage languages. In addition, School District No. 44 in North Vancouver is in the process of responding to changes in the structure of their intermediate program, and expect that heritage languages will be a part of this. School District No. 36 in Surrey expects to be piloting one or two programs with the Ministry during the 1990-91 year, and also reports that the Sikh community is requesting courses in heritage languages, which may lead to further pilot programs. School District No. 47 in Powell River is working with the local Indian Band on the Sliammon Reserve exploring the possibilities of introducing the Coast Salish language. The Vancouver School Board provides space at no cost or at cost on Saturdays for over 3000 students per term. This is all non-credit and in non-school hours.

PROGRAMS

QUEBEC

OF THE 11 school commissions in Quebec responding to the CEA survey, seven do not offer any heritage language programs, primarily because the ethnic composition of their community is predominantly francophone. At least one school commission prefers to concentrate on developing programs to help integrate the immigrants into the community. The Commission des écoles catholiques de Québec feels that, "It is important to contribute as much as possible to the integration of allophones into the francophone Quebec community. As a result, apart from the intercultural welcome, education and exchange, our school commission prefers to emphasize the most effective means of support for teaching French to our pupils and their parents. The instruction is in French. On the other hand, only a few allophones who can satisfy the legal requirements of admission to an English language school are eligible to receive instruction in English."

General Information

The four school commissions in Quebec that do offer heritage language programs base their courses on material prepared by the Quebec Ministry of Education. At least two commissions have prepared supplementary materials. The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal has developed curriculum guidelines for Hebrew at the elementary level, which include as appendices various games, creative activities and learning experiences, lexicons, grammar summaries, lists of people and places to visit, the Jewish calendar and an extensive bibliography. At the secondary level, they have developed a guideline for Jewish History Part I (From the Ancient World till the 18th century) in conjunction with the Jewish Education Council of Montreal.

The Quebec Ministry of Education (MEQ) has produced several curriculum guidelines for the teaching of heritage languages, including:

- *Des comptines et des chansons pour mieux communiquer*, for Italian at the elementary level
- *El pan y la cometa*, for Spanish at the grade 4 level

- a grade 4 collection of teaching materials in Arabic
- *As comunidades culturais do Quebeque*, a collection of Portuguese materials for grade 6
- *Os 5 sentidos*, a collection of Portuguese texts for grade 5

The Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal, with the assistance of the Ministry of Education, has prepared a considerable amount of teaching materials for its heritage language programs:

- a bilingual Chinese-French booklet, *Qu'apprend votre enfant au programme d'enseignement des langues d'origine (PELO)?* which describes the themes and principal objectives of the program, by grade, from the first to the sixth year at the primary level.
- *Informations sur le programme d'enseignement des langues d'origine*, published in June 1988.
- *Evaluation des services offerts dans le cadre du PELO et de son impact sur les élèves et sur les écoles (Résumé du rapport de recherche)*, published in April 1987.
- *Actes du colloque sur le PELO: 10 ans après*. Organized jointly by La Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal et le Patronat italo-canadien pour l'aide aux immigrants, May 2, 1987.
- *Description du rendement scolaire des élèves inscrits au PELO*, published in April 1987.
- *L'ouverture du PELO à l'ensemble de la clientèle scolaire*, June 1988
- *Liste de matériel didactique PELO*, September 1990
- list of pedagogical material available in Portuguese
- proposed lesson plans for grade 2 on recreational activities and food
- proposed lesson plans for grade 3 on the neighbourhood
- proposed lesson plans for grade 4 on interplanetary space
- a unit on the environment
- a unit on maple sugaring
- a lesson plan for grade 5 on a haunted house
- a workbook in Portuguese on energy, for use in grade 6
- an Italian workbook on the description of the city or country of origin (pupil's and teacher's workbook)
- an Italian workbook on traffic safety
- *Activités d'interaction*, proceedings from workshops given by Roger Tremblay of the University of Sherbrooke to teachers of PELO in 1987

- statistical compilation 1989-90

The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal has developed resources for Creole (first year) and for Hebrew (elementary and secondary).

Heritage language programs in Quebec began as early as 1976 for the CECM, and as late as 1990 for Brossard. Two main reasons are behind the decision to offer PELO: 1) parents' requests and 2) the Ministry of Education initiatives to offer these courses. Baldwin-Cartier also has a policy on intercultural education that encourages PELO in its schools.

A wide range of languages are offered. For the four school boards that responded in the affirmative, a total of 11 languages are currently taught. Baldwin-Cartier has one group studying Arabic and one group doing Hebrew. Brossard teaches Italian and Mandarin Chinese; at the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, courses are offered in Italian, Hebrew, Arabic, Spanish and Créole; and la Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal (CECM) has programs in nine languages: Arabic, Cambodian, Chinese, Spanish, Greek, Italian, Lao, Portuguese and Vietnamese.

The largest program in the province is that of the Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal, offering nine languages to 2,040 pupils in 25 schools. This program has steadily increased in size over the years, whereas the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal (PSBGM) has seen a decline in enrolment. The program in Brossard has one school, two courses and 25 pupils. Baldwin-Cartier has the PELO program in two schools, with15 pupils doing Hebrew and 17 doing Arabic. The program is too recent at these last two boards to permit any comparison in enrolment figures.

The Quebec boards generally foresee increases in the size of PELO. Baldwin-Cartier plans to teach Chinese and Italian, and Brossard is considering Portuguese and Tagalog. At the Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal, Créole may be offered if the community requests it and the Ministry of Education approves the program presented. At the PSBGM, the decision to offer additional languages depends entirely on parental requests.

One school board has discontinued some heritage language courses: the PSBGM no longer teaches Vietnamese, Punjabi, Swahili, German and Chinese.

Students

In Quebec, PELO is generally offered from grades 1 to 6, except at Brossard where classes begin in kindergarten. At the CECM, classes have recently been introduced at the first and second levels of secondary school.

PELO classes are not limited to children for whom it is a native language, a policy which has been in effect since 1989. In addition, the Ministry of Education obliges the school commissions to respect certain restrictive conditions. The rate of participation of pupils from other linguistic groups varies from 10% to 25%, except in Baldwin-Cartier, where the rate was 0%.

None of the responding school boards offers day care in the heritage language, nor are there any adult classes.

Programs

There do not appear to be any transition programs where the children are "eased in" to being taught in one of the two official languages. Other subjects of the curriculum, such as mathematics and geography, are not taught in the heritage language. The PELO courses are not considered part of the regular curriculum, nor can they be categorized as "continuing education," a term which in Quebec is applicable only to adults.

The PELO classes in the non-integrated format are given from Monday to Friday outside of regular classroom hours, either early in the morning, at noon, or immedi-

ately after school. Baldwin-Cartier offers the program after school for 150 minutes a week, in three classes of 50 minutes each. The CECM has two schools that use the integrated schedule for the first cycle of the primary program. The integrated schedule consists of PELO classes during the regular classroom hours, that is, between 8:30 a.m. and noon, or between 1:00 and 3:00 p.m. Classes generally begin in the second week of September and finish in the second week of June, averaging two and a half hours per week.

Teaching Staff

Qualifications for instructors of PELO vary from board to board. The CECM uses primarily experienced people with teaching certificates from their home country. Baldwin-Cartier has instructors with experience either in Canada or in their home country, although in the year 1989-90 none had a teaching certificate. Brossard and the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal hire qualified instructors.

For three school commissions, professional development for teachers of PELO is limited to the workshops put on by the Ministry of Education. The CECM offers assistance as required by the consultant working in the area, touching on such areas as pedagogical methods for reading, writing, and oral work, the methods recommended by the Ministry, evaluation, and "strategies to improve motivation."

Class sizes average 15 to 20 students.

PELO instructors in Quebec use the curriculum developed by the Ministry, with primarily an interactive communicative approach.

Each of the responding school commissions has on staff other people who speak the heritage language.

Community Involvement

Community involvement is not as well developed in Quebec as in some other provinces. For the PSBGM, it is limited to requesting programs. For Baldwin-Cartier, it is possible to invite people to the school, but that did not happen in 1989-90. In the CECM, community participation is restricted. Some instructors organize visits to cultural centres, particularly around the holidays. CECM also said that they regularly receive visits from foreign inspectors, mostly Portuguese, and note that the Portuguese government has recently given official recognition to their PELO program because of its high quality.

School boards were asked about the community input into the development of the PELO curriculum. Baldwin-Cartier said that as a first step, the parents make the request to the school. Secondly, a poll is done of all those at the school who speak that language. The MEQ gives permission to begin a PELO group when there are 15 to 20 students. Following this, a selection committee is established to choose the instructor. This committee consists of the principal of the school involved, the consultant and a parent chosen to verify the language. For the CECM, the community is of great assistance in instructor recruitment, but decision-making power rests in the hands of the commission.

The PELO courses frequently have a cultural component, such as the celebration of traditional holidays, cooking, arts and crafts, dance, etc. For CECM, it is "particularly dance. However, we emphasize the learning priorities we have established."

Administration

School commissions in Quebec all receive the same funding for the PELO, which consists of provincial grants that pay the instructors' salaries, and a grant of $150 per group for the purchase of materials. No additional funds are provided by the Ministry for professional development of the instructors. Thus, as Baldwin-Cartier

says, "it is up to each school to find means to allow this professional development."

In Quebec, transportation is not provided for heritage language instruction.

Assessment

Students are generally satisfied with the heritage language instruction, except in the PSBGM, where they show little enthusiasm. In one of its programs, Baldwin-Cartier attributes this satisfaction to the efforts of the teacher: "She was very dynamic, and knew how to communicate this dynamism and a sense of pride in speaking her language (Arabic) to her students."

The parents as well appear quite satisfied with the program. At Baldwin-Cartier, "they appreciate that all costs are borne by the MEQ. They are glad that their children can maintain (or learn) their language of origin without having to force them to go to school on Saturday. At the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, parents "urge such teaching as a reaction to their children's integration into our society."

Teachers in Quebec are also generally satisfied with the PELO program. At the PSBGM, "most teachers enjoy the work because of cultural interest." CECM mentions that "instructors of PELO are satisfied with the program, even though they complain of the lack of suitable teaching materials adapted to Montreal children. They are unhappy with their working conditions. The other instructors in the school have mixed feelings about the program, ranging from resigned acceptance to intolerance." Baldwin-Cartier raises problems that are more serious: "The teaching staff feels either reticence or indifference towards these courses. They feel that the child who must master French because he is in a French school (in many cases because of Bill 101) already has, in many cases, enough difficulties without requiring him to learn a heritage language that his parents know well but that many children don't know very well. However, in defence of the teachers, we should point out that very few know that these courses follow closely in stride with the *Charter of Human Rights* which allows anyone to promote and to maintain his language and culture of origin. The context of application of these courses is very poorly known by teachers."

It appears that children in the Quebec schools are speaking the heritage language outside the classroom, in the playground, with their siblings, etc., except for Hebrew which is used primarily at the religious level. The only school commission that says the children are not using the language outside of the classroom is the CECM, "particularly because of the Quebec context, language risks disappearance, hence the directives to increase its standing."

The administrators in the Quebec school commissions believe that they notice a link between the language abilities of the children taking heritage language courses and their aptitudes in the official language of instruction, (i.e., French or English). Most find that knowledge gained in one language is easily transferred to another language be it English or French. At the CECM, "there is an obvious link even though no systematic research has been carried out in this area on pupils in the PELO." And, as for the aptitude of the children who take heritage language courses to master a third language, such as French or English as a second language, here again the reaction is positive. In the CECM, "language teaching has a positive impact on the cognitive affective development of children and hence on their intellectual development. Thus, with few exceptions, well-done language teaching favours the acquisition of a third language." The CEA survey also asked if the boards had found that the PELO had any effect, whether negative or positive, on the total school experience of the child. Even if it is difficult to generalize, most said that it is positive.

Advantages cited for the PELO were numerous, and included:

- a better integration of the child
- improved affective and cognitive development of the child
- stronger links between the parents and the school, which promotes integration

- increased participation of a greater number of professionals from the cultural communities in the labour market
- increased learning of French
- ability to meet community needs
- the capacity to communicate with the family who live in the country of origin
- PELO allows children to adopt their heritage language as a vehicle of communication and not as a dead language
- valorization of the language and culture of the child, and, thus, of his or her identity

Disadvantages for the program were less numerous than advantages; administrative problems were cited most often. Baldwin-Cartier would like to have more information and consequently a greater acceptance of these courses. They also would like to see a better follow-up of teachers and students, a greater involvement of the parents, as well as more appropriate teaching materials. The PSBGM lamented the fact that these programs are not integrated into the regular curriculum. At the CECM, "majority acceptance of this program is raising quite a bit of resistance."

ONTARIO

Of the 23 school boards in Ontario that responded to the CEA survey on heritage language, 19 offered programs and four did not.

General Information

Among the four boards not offering programs, the Timmins District Roman Catholic Separate School Board indicates that, although they do not offer a heritage language program, they "work, support and co-operate with the co-terminous board which offers a selection of program." The Metropolitan Toronto School Board, which is predominantly an umbrella board operating only schools for the developmentally handicapped, does, however, report some activity in heritage language instruction. In co-operation with the other public boards of education in Metropolitan Toronto, they have initiated and are developing curriculum support documents and guidelines, including one generic resource document for heritage language teachers working with students in junior kindergarten through grade 8. (The Toronto Board of Education is the lead board in the development of this generic curriculum guideline.) The intent of this document is to enhance heritage language instruction by assisting teachers in improving student outcomes in language acquisition. Through development and field review, the final outcome should be a comprehensive resource that will answer some very important questions as to what, how, and why - associated with sound instructional practices for many instructors who do not have teacher training in their backgrounds. It is hoped that this document will give fundamental information applicable to instructors of all languages other than English or French.

Many other boards in Ontario, primarily the larger ones, such as Etobicoke, London, North York, Scarborough, Ottawa and Metro Toronto Separate, have also developed policies and their own guidelines and materials for many languages.

Starting dates for heritage language programs in Ontario vary. Wellington County Board of Education in Guelph took over an existing program at least 25 years ago. The public boards in Hamilton and Thunder Bay initiated programs in the early 70s at the request of the particular communities, and the Toronto Board of Education launched an early pilot program in Italian, which was not defined as a heritage language but was an elective program offering an overview of linguistic and cultural components. However, by far the majority of the boards responding in Ontario (11 out

of 19 with programs) began their programs following the Ontario Ministry of Education's decision in 1977 to fund heritage language programs as part of the continuing education program. Most of these boards cited the Ministry initiative along with community and parent request, and some also indicated that they had taken over an existing program. There were, however, a few boards who did not initiate programs until the Ministry announced its intention to amend the regulation to require school boards to offer the program where sufficient numbers of parents request it. York Region established its first and second programs in January 1989 and September 1989, for two reasons, "because it was known that legislation was imminent. (We took over) an existing program which had operated a few years." Scarborough first offered heritage languages on October 30, 1989, because of provincial legislation. (On July 14, 1989, the Ontario Minister of Education announced a deadline of July 31, 1989, for parents to request new heritage language classes to start in the fall. School boards were then required to offer instruction in a specific heritage language at the request of parents of 25 or more children eligible to attend elementary schools operated by that board. Boards then had 90 days to arrange heritage language classes to begin no later than October 31, 1989.)

The largest heritage language programs are, not surprisingly, found in the larger centres of Central Ontario. The board for the City of Toronto has over 10,000 students enrolled in 38 language programs. North York serves 11,000 students in 75 locations, representing 38 languages. Peel Board in Mississauga and Brampton has 3,300 students in 23 languages. But by far the largest program is offered by the Metro Toronto Separate School Board, which teaches 15 languages to 30,041 students. Some 23,922 students takes classes during the day, 5,837 on Saturday or Sunday, and 282 in the evening, in a total of 1,285 classes. Smaller programs do exist: Hastings-Prince Edward County Roman Catholic Separate School Board began its program in September 1990, teaching Italian, at the request of the community, to 25 students in one school. The Renfrew County Roman Catholic Separate School Board has three schools all offering Polish to a total of 43 students. The Lambton County Board of Education in Sarnia has 189 students in 13 classes studying seven languages. Similarly, the Windsor Roman Catholic Separate School board offers 9 languages at 12 locations with an average enrolment of 780 students.

The list of languages taught in Ontario is comprehensive, to say the least: Albanian, Amharic, Arabic (Palestinian, Muslim and Islamic), Armenian, Assyrian, Bengali, Celtic, Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese), Croatian, Czech-Slovak, Dari, Dawat, Dutch, Estonian, Farsi, Finn, Gaelic, German, Greek (Hellenic and Orthodox), Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Igbo, Italian, Japanese, Khmer (Cambodian), Korean, Kurdish, Lao, Latvian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Malayalee, Maltese, Marathi, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Pushtu-Dari, Russian, Serbian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovenian, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Tigrinya, Turkish, Ukrainian, Urdu (Islamic and Muslim), Vietnamese, Yiddish, and Yoruba. Four of the boards in Metropolitan Toronto also offer a course in Black or African Heritage: these include the City of York, the City of Toronto, North York and Peel. The City of York also has a Canadian Native Studies Program.

The majority of Metro Toronto boards reported steady increases in the number of languages taught and the number of students. For Peel, "the enrolment in the program overall has grown from 10-20% annually. In the last few years the number of languages has levelled off in the low twenties." Only two boards, Windsor RCSSB and Renfrew County RCSSB, indicated that their programs had remained consistent in size since their inception. And only one board registered a decline: the Lakehead Board of Education in Thunder Bay found that their enrolments decreased as the separate board became much more active in this area.

When asked about projected increases, many of the Ontario boards indicated their responsiveness to community or parental request, and some cited the Ministry requirement that boards offer heritage language programs at parent request. Peel sees "the program as fluid - responding to the needs of our community. As a particular language grows in demand/popularity in the community we would introduce it." North York indicates that they have "an outreach worker liaising to communities to

encourage the initiation of classes in African languages such as Swahili." The London Board indicated plans to offer the Chippewa Native language. Other languages under consideration include: German (three boards), Farsi (two), Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Somali, and Arabic. Only four boards have no plans to offer additional languages: Renfrew County RCSSB, Windsor RCCSB, Lakehead, and Hastings Prince Edward County RCSSB. The latter said: "We have a growing Spanish community and have declared our willingness to offer the program. However, few responded to the survey."

When asked if they had discontinued any languages, the boards indicated that the program fluctuates quite a bit with community request. Only five boards indicated that they had not discontinued any languages. Of the other 18, languages no longer being taught include: Slovenian, Yoruba, Chinese, Ukrainian, Hindu, German, Czech, Croatian, Italian, Portuguese, Maltese, Malayam, Hebrew, Gaelic, Kerala, Punjabi and Arabic. In response to the question about plans to discontinue any class, the boards again mentioned that sufficient enrolment was their criteria; the only board planning to suspend a language (Japanese) was Hamilton.

Students

Of the boards in Ontario offering programs, nine run classes from junior kindergarten through to grade 8; four run classes from kindergarten to grade 8; Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry County Board of Education in Cornwall teaches Greek and Vietnamese from grades 1 to 8; and Lakehead in Thunder Bay begins instruction in Portuguese, Greek and Finn at grade 2. Four boards, Windsor Roman Catholic, Ottawa public, Peel and North York all indicate that they offer heritage languages through the Senior Division as well. Third language credit courses at Peel in Mississauga/Brampton include (with their enrolment): Arabic (18), Bengali (26), Cantonese (60), Greek (79), Gujarati (15), Hindi (46), Japanese (15), Mandarin (98), Punjabi (16), Tamil (15), Urdu (25), and Vietnamese (12). (Total: languages 12, enrolment 425.) These credit courses are all grade 9, there are eight grade 10 levels and a grade 11 Modern Greek. North York offers year-long courses Saturdays from 9:00 a.m. until noon, all at the advanced level, in Cantonese, Greek, Gujarati, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, Punjabi and German. In addition, Hebrew is offered Sunday morning.

The CEA survey asked whether the boards restricted their heritage language classes to students of that particular ethnic group. None did. Of the boards who could estimate a percentage of students studying a language that was not spoken in their home, most said 1 to 2%, or 5 to 10%. The Toronto Board of Education said 20% and the Metropolitan Separate School Board (Toronto) said 15%.

None of the Ontario school boards offers any day care in the heritage language.

Five of the Ontario boards offering heritage languages do not offer a similar program to adults, the other 14 do. Involvement ranges from two adults taking Polish with the Renfrew County RCSSB and "some adults attend classes but are not counted in the heritage language program enrolment" at Lambton County, to the majority of most urban boards which offer general interest courses in a variety of languages. These include: Arabic, Bengali, Cantonese, Croatian, Dutch, Farsi, Finn, French, Gaelic, German, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Kurdish, Mandarin, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, Ukrainian, Urdu, Vietnamese, Welsh, and Yiddish. Toronto Board of Education offers some 19 adult general interest language courses. The Peel Board also noted that all their credit courses are open to adults wishing to study these languages, in addition to their interest courses. Again, the criteria for offering adult courses are almost universally community interest and request.

Programs

None of the Ontario boards now offers any transitional programs, although the

Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board had these in place in the late 60s and early 70s at two schools.

No bilingual programs are offered: heritage languages are taught as a separate class, in continuing education, with emphasis on the linguistic component. Other subjects of the curriculum, such as geography or history, may be touched on in the context of the program.

The CEA survey also asked about the schedules boards use for their heritage language classes. Six boards teach on weekends only, predominantly for three hours on Saturday mornings. Six boards teach evenings and Saturday mornings. York Region teaches their heritage language classes after school only, after 4:30 p.m. The Board of Education for the City of York teaches heritage language in the afternoons, weekends, lunch hours, before the school day begins or at summer school. Lambton County offers this program in the evenings only. Both North York and East York teach heritage languages after school, on weekends, and during summer school. Two school boards, the City of Toronto and the Metropolitan Separate School Board (Toronto), use three models of schedules: weekends, after school (evenings and afternoons), as well as the extended/integrated day.

In 1977, the Ontario Ministry of Education released a memorandum which read in part:

> *The Ministry of Education will implement a Heritage Languages Program to be effective as of July 1, 1977. For the purposes of this program, a heritage language is any language other than the two official languages of Canada.*
>
> *(...)*
>
> *Under this program, any group of parents will be able to approach its local school board with the request that heritage language classes for elementary school children be given under the Continuing Education Program. Such classes may be offered after school, or on non-school days, or where numbers justify an extension of the required 5-hour school day. Under this program, no student may receive more than 2 1/2 hours instruction per week, or more than 2 1/2 hours per day in the case of summer school classes.*
>
> *(...)*
>
> *The instructors hired by the boards for these classes need not have Ontario certification but should have qualifications acceptable to the boards, principals, and the parents' groups.*

The extended/integrated day model was the subject of some controversy for over one year between the Toronto Board of Education and the Toronto Teachers' Federation. In 1982, the Board adopted a policy that permitted elementary schools to extend the school day by 30 minutes for instruction in a heritage language - a language other than French or English. This policy required a community vote at the local school level to determine whether the majority of parents wished to have such a program in their school. The Toronto Teachers' Federation took a position against the extension of the school day: the teachers maintained that heritage language instruction should be taught after school hours, so as not to conflict with their other duties. The teachers and the board agreed to binding arbitration to resolve the contentious issue of whether teachers should be required to teach languages other than English or French during the school day. In June 1986, the arbitration board found that the procedures developed by the Toronto board for the implementation of the programs were within the board's jurisdiction. "Giving heritage programs prime time during the school day serves to erode and diminish the alienation that ethnic communities feel towards one of our most important institutions. Moreover, in our view, the teaching of the heritage language after school serves to segregate and ghettoize elementary school children. (...) The new-found respect and rapport that immigrant and refugee families find in an integrated system enhances the long-term prospects to educate children from immigrant families," the arbitration board said in its 28-page decision.

The Toronto Board of Education carried out a very extensive study of this issue

in 1984-85, in all 15 of the schools offering the integrated/extended day program. They released the research report *Teaching Heritage Languages and Cultures in an Integrated/Extended Day*, in July 1986. The main purpose was to describe the setting of the newly developed Integrated/Extended Day Heritage Language and Black Cultural Programs in terms of social, cultural, economic, educational, political, demographic and psychological variables. The text and tables in this report describe and detail a multitude of issues related to the integrated/extended day programs including methods of implementation, effects on the children, effects on the regular staff and school day, working and social accommodations between the teachers and instructors, reactions of regular staff as described by themselves and perceived by others, opinions about the instructors, distribution of information, responsibilities and duties of regular staff and instructors, involvement of parents, materials and resources, and changes that should be made if the program was to be continued.

The Toronto Board of Education currently operates, in the fall of 1990, classes in 21 integrated/extended day schools as part of the regular school day.

All Ontario boards follow the Ministry of Education requirement and run their heritage language classes for a total of two-and-a-half hours per week, usually from mid-September to the end of May, 30 or 32 weeks, for a total of 80 hours. The Hamilton Board indicated that Polish and Portuguese have some additional time at their own cost. Ottawa and Peel offer credit courses for three or three-and-a-half hours per week.

Teaching Staff

The Ontario Ministry of Education decision to designate heritage language programs as part of continuing education allowed the boards to hire Continuing Education Instructors (as opposed to certificated teachers) at some financial saving.

Of the 19 Ontario boards offering heritage language programs, only one indicated that their applicants come from the regular teaching staff. The rest echoed the status of Etobicoke: "[We employ] paid staff not holding provincial certification, but many of them have teacher certificates from the country of origin, or an individual who has the academic/linguistic abilities to satisfy our teaching requirements."

To the question: "Are the heritage language instructors all native speakers of the language?" most boards said yes, two said most are, and the Metropolitan Separate School Board (Toronto) reported that "over 95% are native speakers."

Estimates of the numbers of heritage language instructors holding provincial certification ranged from 0 to 5% to 13%.

The CEA survey also asked what professional development opportunities were available to instructors of heritage languages. Six of the Ontario boards said that there was nothing available right now. The other boards indicated that these instructors were, in the words of the City of York (Toronto) "free to take part in all professional development activities offered by the board," and added that specific workshops are arranged from two to three times per year. Peel noted the "regular in-service by the boards, programs offered by universities and conferences held by various language groups and associations." In North York, heritage language instructors are expected to attend an average of four activities per year. Etobicoke provides seminars and one-to-one tutoring, whenever needed. The Toronto Board of Education, which operates one of the largest heritage language programs in Ontario, offers one summer in-service, two major general in-services, and three language-specific in-services for major languages. The Metropolitan Separate School Board and Scarborough Board of Education reported a 90-hour certificate program, and York Region said they are currently negotiating with York University to offer a partial credit course in teaching heritage languages. The Ottawa Board of Education also mentioned courses at the university level. In addition to the regular conferences and in-service programs, the Windsor RCSS Board told us that the Italian consulate provides a consultant travelling throughout the country providing in-service, and furnishes them with textbooks.

Average class sizes for heritage language were generally in the range of 15 to 25. The Toronto public board and Peel both had an average of 16 students per class.

London registered an average of 12, with some classes as low as two students.

A variety of language pedagogical methods are used, generally whole language and immersion activity-based. The City of York typically uses "a variety of approaches focused on communicative strategies with small and large group activities." York Region notes that its instructors speak mainly in the target language, with minimal English translation. The Scarborough Board of Education uses teacher-directed activities, including group work and individual activities. The Metropolitan Separate School Board, perhaps because it has one of the largest heritage language programs, said they have a "variety of techniques used depending on the ability and language proficiency of the students, personal teaching style, particular lesson, etc." Materials used include textbooks (prose and poetry), workbooks, overheads, films, games, music, art, personal experiences, field trips, etc. One director of education said that the methods his instructors use are "mostly socratic; mostly based in grammar; the main purpose of my professional development is to help them break out of the traditional mode."

Several of the boards in Ontario have developed their own teaching materials for heritage language, partly because the programs have been in existence for so long, and partly because of the lack of materials in the more obscure languages. However it is sometimes the individual teachers who develop their own materials. Samples were received from the London Board of Education (Greek), and Etobicoke (Chinese and Gujarati). The Peel Board of Education produced a 364-page teacher's manual for heritage language, covering long range planning, daily lesson planning, evaluation, using themes, making books, and language games and activities. Several other boards, including Metro Separate and Ottawa, indicated that they have materials and/or guidelines available in draft form only. York Region mentioned course outlines developed for Korean, Hebrew and Cantonese. Lambton County makes use of materials developed by the Chinese and Greek communities. The East York Board of Education purchases materials from other sources and uses community-based materials.

Other staff in the schools often speak the heritage language(s) being taught: only two boards said no, six said probably and the remaining 11 said yes, but admitted, as is the case with Toronto, that it is "not a prerequisite, although due to the multicultural nature of the city ...yes." Several of the large urban boards have many native speakers of the heritage language on staff, ranging from teachers to teacher aides to secretaries.

Community Involvement

Only two of the 19 responding boards in Ontario with programs indicated that they do not have any community involvement; for the rest, it is fairly well established. Lambton County has limited involvement, "the Chinese have a lady who comes in to teach music." Most boards seem to follow Etobicoke, who said: "Most languages have a Parents Association with whom we keep in touch and consult from time to time." East York (Toronto) uses "communication and co-operation with informal parent groups and more formalized community organizations depending on language." North York and Peel, two of the larger boards offering heritage language, have a large spectrum of community involvement, including cross-cultural co-ordinators or formal home and school liaison committees, visits to cultural centres and ethnic associations, special visitors to the school, and parents or grandparents volunteering as classroom assistants. For the Metro Separate School Board, this involvement consists of "instructors from parents' communities to help them with special presentations such as plays, concerts, etc. They also invite parents to do crafts and speak on special topics. (They have) advisory committees for each heritage language group - their input is taken into consideration." The Toronto Board of Education also has a well-established system of community involvement: "A sub-committee of the Board, HELACON (Heritage Languages and Concurrent Program Consultative Committee), is composed of community representatives of the various language groups. It meets monthly to discuss issues involving heritage programs. In addition, local parent-school liaison committees deal with local heritage program problems." In the London

Board of Education, "each language has a parents' committee which provides some funds and gives advice about staffing and program. There are also some parent volunteers." The parents' committee of the Renfrew RCSS Board worked together on a community effort to raise money to send four students to Poland for summer camp to learn Polish. For one of the smaller heritage language programs in the Ontario boards, that of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry (two languages, 37 students), community involvement is high: "the local language associations are mainly responsible for content and program under the supervision of the part-time board co-ordinator."

An interesting fact: for York Region, "community involvement takes place in the extended program, i.e., classes beyond the 2 1/2 hours per week mandated by the legislation and not under board supervision."

Most of the parents' committees have input into the curriculum of the heritage language classes, usually through the advisory committees. Involvement ranges from "nil at present" for Hamilton and "little" at Lakehead in Thunder Bay, to "some" to "a great deal." The Ottawa Board of Education reports that the parent groups have 50% of the input: "The curriculum is a joint effort between the board curriculum supervisor and the heritage language group." For the York Region Board of Education, some large community organizations provide educational material and curriculum (Hebrew, Gujarati, Cantonese, Greek). In Peel, "depending on the community, some have a great deal of input - especially in the area of instructional materials." At the Etobicoke Board of Education, the Parent Association is consulted in the selection of instructors, especially for the language aspect of interviews.

The CEA survey asked about the cultural component to heritage language programs. Only two of the 19 boards in Ontario offering programs did not offer a cultural component: for Hastings-Prince Edward RCSS Board, it was "not yet - but would be desirable." and for Hamilton "nil at present." The rest were all very active, as East York said: "cultural activities frequently provide the basis for communicative development of language." Activities include Christmas concerts, the celebration of all cultural holidays, concerts, trips, dance, drama, songs, poems, films, arts and crafts, and cooking. The heritage language programs in Lambton County frequently join church festivities. In Peel Region, several language groups offer an extended program that reinforces the cultural components.

Administration

In Ontario, 12 of the school boards who told us of their heritage language programs received only the Ministry of Education grants towards their operating funding. Two boards also indicated that some support is furnished by the local property taxes, and two receive some help from community groups with resource materials and cultural components. Two boards told us that parent committees raise money to assist, and two boards mentioned federal heritage language grants.

As for transportation, the only board to provide any assistance is the Renfrew County RCSS Board, and that is limited to a total of $1,000 per year for three classes. For all the rest, transportation is the responsibility of the parents.

Assessment

The Ontario pupils appear to be overwhelmingly positive about their heritage language programs. Most boards rate student satisfaction as good to excellent. In the City of York, "the students appear to enjoy learning a heritage language and participating in the programs with other children." For the Metro Separate Board, "by and large, students enjoy their heritage language classes where they experience the comfort of home and they perform better in other areas of school life." East York was quite specific: "as an activity-centered approach is strengthened, pupil participation is strengthened." For Scarborough, the "retention rate indicates satisfaction." The one drawback was summed up by the Hamilton Board of Education: "it seems that, in

talking with parents, many children do not appreciate the extra time they must spend in school." Peel Board felt that their students were generally satisfied, although "some are obliged to attend due to parental pressure." London, as well, found that "students enjoy the courses, although we sometimes have to work to keep them interested, especially in Saturday classes." The Windsor RCSS Board noted: "Based on retention of pupils, it appears well received especially in primary and junior grades. High school aged pupils view it as a complement to regular day classes - movement to age appropriate classes seems more acceptable than ability grouping."

The parents across Ontario also appear to be enthusiastic about the program: as the City of York said, "Most parents are acutely aware of the importance and value of learning a second or third language." Windsor RCSS Board found the parents "very appreciative - it is an extension of the native language and culture of home." The London Board of Education also found that "parents are very enthusiastic, as evidenced by the steady rise in enrolment." For the Metro Separate Board, "parents like the idea that their children can communicate with them, they can enjoy their culture and they feel good about themselves."

Similarly, the heritage language instructors across Ontario appear pleased with the program. In Lambton County, "all would like their own classroom and more supplies, but are satisfied with the services." London echoed this sentiment: "Teachers are fully supportive, but would like more by way of financial support for supplies." Metro Separate School Board said that "most instructors love to teach in the heritage languages program. They feel they are contributing to the maintenance and development of Heritage/Canadian culture." Interestingly, the Hamilton Board of Education replied: "Many teachers are university graduates and enjoy their classes, as do those with teaching certificates. Those without these qualifications seem to have a less favourable view of the program." Peel Board felt that "teachers are generally satisfied, especially with our current emphasis on staff and curriculum development." For the Windsor RCSS Board, "teachers are becoming more supportive of age groupings as opposed to ability groupings. Staff turn-over is minimal and usually due to attrition, so it appears that teacher satisfaction is high." East York noted that "teachers participate in professional in-service and have made a key commitment to students and to the building of the program."

In the CEA survey, we asked the school boards if their students were using the heritage language outside of the classroom, with siblings, friends, and parents. Five of the boards (predominantly those with smaller programs) did not know, and only one board said no. Five boards replied in the affirmative, and the remaining boards all said: "Yes, to some extent." For Ottawa, it was approximately 60% of the time, both the City of Toronto and the Windsor RCSS Board said that the language was used primarily in the home. For East York, it had some home use, depending on the family use, whereas it had a limited use in the schoolyard, depending on the numbers. The London Board of Education, had an interesting observation: "older students tend to use English, younger ones their first language."

Can any connection be made between the language abilities of the students in heritage language programs and their performance in the official language of instruction (French or English)? Ten boards could not comment at this time, some said it was because their programs have not been running long enough. Two boards did not have their own data prepared on this question, but as the Board of Education for the City of York said: "Ample research has been done on this issue across the world and it seems to support the view that second and third language learning improves first language learning." The remaining six boards were overwhelmingly positive on this question. As the Toronto Board of Education said, "The more languages a child knows, the easier it is to learn additional languages. Yes, students' abilities in language are easily transferred." Peel finds that "although no formal study has been done, we find that participation in a heritage language program generally enhances language acquisition skills." East York concurred: "The understanding that literacy skills are transferable is growing. More elementary teachers and principals (are) noting greater cognitive flexibility in multilingual students."

The Lambton County Board of Education found that individual circumstances

vary: "Some students are fluent in both languages, others are very weak in their own, others (a few) in English. It depends how long they have lived in Canada."

The York Region Board of Education in Aurora added: "Although research has shown that development of heritage language skills reinforces English academic skills, this research is based on *bilingual* programs as opposed to heritage language programs which teach the language as a *subject*. I question whether two and a half hours per week of language instruction makes a difference in a student's academic performance."

Further on the issue of the transfer of these language acquisition skills, we asked about the students' ability to master a third language. Of the 19 Ontario boards responding, 13 were unable to comment at this time, again for either lack of time or data. The remaining boards were, however, quite positive. The City of York noted: "Learning a second language improves first language learning and other language learning; it prompts self confidence and positive attitudes towards the acquisition of other languages." For East York, "the key is the attitude to language learning in the school environment."

CEA was also interested in any impact the heritage language programs might have on the students' total experience at school. Here, 11 boards did not have data to respond, but the remaining eight found it to be generally positive. The Toronto Board of Education found that their program "enhances a student's knowledge of self and self-esteem as well as knowledge and understanding of others." According to the Windsor RCSS Board, "those unsatisfied with heritage language usually cease attending so the impact on total school experience is minimal. Those who remain enjoy the experience so total school experience is enhanced."

Advantages seen for the heritage language programs were numerous in Ontario. They include:

- increased self-confidence and self-esteem; understanding of one's background
- improved language acquisition skills; opportunity to become trilingual at an early age
- increased status for ethnic communities within the school board
- understanding and acceptance of other cultures, and respect for the variety of cultures and races in our society; multicultural awareness
- a link between home and regular classroom; it encourages parents who may not normally come to the school to visit
- greater opportunities for worldwide communications and opportunities
- responses to community needs; community outreach
- strengthened cognitive flexibility of students
- provision of greater marketable skills in the adult world, assuming heritage language programs are followed by credit classes
- "future goal of multilingual experts for our country"
- community involvement in school activities
- extension of language and culture of home
- additional communication ability with native culture and ancestry
- promotes Canada as a multicultural country
- helps expand English vocabulary
- increased job opportunities in government, communication, education, business and commerce, etc.
- "it helps a child make the transition to Canadian society by giving them the security of being able to speak their parents' language while learning to speak English outside the home"
- children have some knowledge of parents' native country, the language, culture and history.

Disadvantages were far fewer than advantages; 11 boards did not cite any. The remaining boards most often mentioned practical problems of scheduling, classroom space and lack of equipment, although, as East York phrased it, "much depends on

the value placed on language learning by the individual principal or school." For the Metro Separate School Board, "some difficulties are experienced in scheduling classes in the integrated extended day model." London's major disadvantage was "the lack of qualified teachers in the various languages." Without giving any details, Hamilton told of a "problem with discipline." York Region in Aurora, aside from problems with the day school facilities and equipment not being available, mentioned "factions within language groups" and felt that "the parents' expectations regarding curriculum and teaching strategies are often outdated." In the Lambton County Board of Education, "attendance is a problem. Some students find the day very long." Similarly, the Windsor RCSS Board, said: "being on Saturday mornings, there is a conflict with other extra-curricular activites, e.g., sports tournaments. Distance can be an impediment for attendance, especially in inclement weather." One large metropolitan board had a more political response: "The only difficulties that exist are those created by the politics that characterize language education in this country. The teaching of languages is perceived as a threat to the status quo."

The Windsor RCSS Board pointed out two other details. One, "the federal grants are diminishing so funding will be affected." Two, the "possibility of direct contact with participating consulates might reduce time lag and costs of acquiring materials."

The Etobicoke Board of Education added: "The heritage language program offers the board the opportunity to teach 'Canadianism' to students whose ethnocultural origin is quite different from the Canadian experience."

MANITOBA

In public schools in Manitoba, heritage or second languages are taught as "languages of study" in core programs, or as "languages of instruction" in bilingual and immersion programs.

General Information

Of the four boards in Manitoba who responded that they do have heritage language programs, Garden Valley School Division No. 26 in Winkler offers German to their predominantly Mennonite population, and has always done so. Winnipeg No. 1 began their program in 1970, Seven Oaks in 1985, and St. James-Assiniboia in the mid-70s. All originated the program due to community request; St. James-Assiniboia also credits teacher initiative.

Languages offered include German, Filipino, Portuguese, Ukrainian, Mandarin, Polish, Italian, Punjabi and Yiddish. Seven Oaks offers two bilingual programs (language of instruction), Ukrainian/English with enrolments of 135, and Hebrew/English, with enrolments of 158. In Winnipeg No. 1, ten schools offer five languages in classes ranging in size from 7 to 35. (The minimum size requirement is currently under review: see Appendix D.) In Seven Oaks, six schools offer six languages; class sizes range from 19 to 34. German is offered at two schools in St. James, a junior high and a collegiate, where class sizes go from 28 in grade 7 to 6 in grade 12. Winkler offers German in all 14 of its schools, and 75% of their student body take it.

All four boards indicated that their programs have remained constant in size or have increased, adding new languages. Only Winkler noted a decrease in their enrolments since their French program was broadened. None of the four boards plans to offer any new languages, none has discontinued any languages and none has plans to discontinue any. The only change in program was noted in Winkler where the start date was being moved from grade 1 to grade 4.

Students

Winnipeg No. 1 offers programs from grades 1-12, Seven Oaks from grades 1-6, St. James-Assiniboia from 7-12, and Winkler from 1-12 (soon to be 4-12).

These Manitoba boards do not restrict the heritage language classes to native speakers of the language. Winnipeg No. 1 states that over 95% of their students are from other backgrounds; Seven Oaks found only four or five students in total taking a language that was not their native one; St. James indicated that 75% of the students in their German program are not of that descent, while Winkler had from 1% - 2% of their German students not of that ancestry.

Seven Oaks is alone in offering day care in the heritage language. One Ukrainian nursery school is currently operating and a Hebrew one is planned, but they are sponsored by the community, not the school division. None of the boards offers transitional programs.

Adult classes include Low German offered by Winkler and Conversational German and Spanish offered by St. James-Assiniboia.

Programs

Winnipeg No. 1 offers two heritage language bilingual programs, in Hebrew and Ukrainian, from kindergarten to grades 6, where up to 50% of the academic content is in the target language. They also offer heritage language instruction as part of the regular day, or more properly, as a "withdrawal" of 20 minutes a day from the regular classroom. (The options of the scheduling are currently subject to review. See Appendix D.)

Seven Oaks offers two bilingual programs in Ukrainian and Hebrew, where subjects of the regular curriculum are taught in the target language. They also have a separate after-school program which operates under the aegis of the Community Schools Program (Continuing Education.) Classes for five heritage languages are held on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday each week from 4:15 to 5:00 p.m. from September until May 31. Yiddish has chosen Tuesday and Thursday from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m. Students in the after-school program thus get 2 to 2 1/4 hours per week. Neither St. James-Assiniboia nor Winkler offers any bilingual programs.

Classes in Manitoba range in size from seven to 35 students.

Teaching Staff

Winnipeg No. 1, St. James-Assiniboia and Winkler all use regular teachers holding Manitoba certification. Seven Oaks places advertisements for native speakers of the language in question, and prefers to hire people with teaching experience. Most people hired there do hold a teaching certificate from their homeland, not necessarily a Manitoba certificate. All boards but Winkler hire only native speakers. Three boards use only teachers with Manitoba certification, whereas Seven Oaks has only three out of 16 heritage language teachers holding certificates. However, all teachers in the Seven Oaks bilingual programs have Manitoba certificates.

Professional development opportunities for heritage language teachers in Manitoba include:

- second language acquisition training through the French and Modern Languages consultant at Winnipeg No. 1
- seminars sponsored by the Manitoba Modern Language Association

- seminars offered by the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages
- local workshops
- the annual provincial in-service in September, from Manitoba Education and Training
- national conferences
- Goethe Institute sponsored courses in Germany (summer only)
- Heritage language courses offered by the University of Manitoba (see description under Teacher Training)

Teaching methods in Manitoba heritage language programs are varied, but lean towards a communicative approach. Seven Oaks says that their methods "range from very traditional to activity-based teaching/learning situations. Emphasis is placed on the development of listening and speaking skills." Winkler puts a "strong emphasis on language development - speaking, interacting, etc., very similar to the whole language approach."

Curriculum guidelines are supplied by Manitoba Education and Training, and are supplemented in some cases by the boards. Seven Oaks has developed one for Yiddish (see Appendix C) and is developing one for Punjabi.

Other staff may or may not be fluent in the language; only Winkler said yes, and St. James-Assiniboia estimated that 15% were fluent.

Community Involvement

Community involvement in Manitoba takes several forms. At the Seven Oaks School Division, the Punjabi community has two community advisers who help with curriculum development, registrations, hiring interviews, and contact with parents. The Filipino parents' association provides support to teachers and assistance with special events. In addition, Polish and Filipino groups regularly prepare a short program to which they invite parents, and serve ethnic refreshments following the presentation. In Winnipeg No. 1, "the interface with the community varies, but when a strong linking exists, it is directed through the school principal."

In the responding boards, the community finds various ways of providing input into the curriculum. In Winnipeg No. 1, as a result of the Heritage Language Review (see Appendix D), "the community will be invited to participate in the curriculum and development process." At Seven Oaks, "members of the ethnic communities sit on the curriculum committees co-ordinated by Manitoba Education and Training." Winkler uses home-school liaison workers to assist with language barriers. They all offer a cultural component to their heritage language classes. Winnipeg No. 1 provides for a major emphasis on cultural celebrations, within the context of multicultural education. In Seven Oaks, "all groups discuss and/or participate in the celebration of traditional holidays. Filipino and Punjabi classes do traditional dancing as part of their program; all groups do some singing." The St. James-Assiniboia Division provides for these activities at the discretion of the teachers; they often take the form of visits to cultural sites or special visitors are invited to the classroom. Winkler holds their activities in conjunction with Education Week.

Administration

The only special funding available is the grants provided by Manitoba Education and Training: $250 per student for bilingual programs and $100 per student for

basic heritage language programs. Beyond that, the school divisions must fund these programs out of the regular operating budget, i.e., provincial grants and local property taxes.

Of the four boards with programs, only Seven Oaks had extra funding available for professional development of their heritage language teachers, and this is restricted to their Ukrainian and Hebrew bilingual programs.

The only responding Manitoba board that makes arrangements for transportation is Seven Oaks. "Transportation is provided for bilingual programs. Transportation is provided to the schools where after-school programs are offered, but it is the responsibility of the parents to pick their child(ren) up on completion of the class at 5:00 p.m."

Assessment

Students in all four responding boards were very satisfied with the heritage language classes. In Winnipeg No. 1, 86% like the program, 1% does not, and 13% don't know. On a related question, 94% were glad to be taking the program, 3% were mad, and 3% were sad. Seven Oaks students were reported to be happy with the program, and are often faced with the dilemma of what to do when heritage language classes conflict with other extra-curricular activities.

Parents also appear to be very satisfied with the instruction received. Because of their current review, exact figures are available in Winnipeg No. 1: 86% of the parents were satisfied, 3% were dissatisfied, and 11% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Teachers echo the positive feelings about the program. The survey done by Winnipeg No.1 found that 67% of Heritage Language teachers were satisfied, but turned up the fact that only 36% of the regular classroom teachers were happy with the program, primarily because it is a "withdrawal" program and they feel that the students get behind in their regular work. Seven Oaks wrote that, "teachers are generally very satisfied with the program and therefore continue to teach each year. This continuity in staffing helps to strengthen the program. There was only one teacher this year who was dissatisfied with the program delivered." St. James-Assiniboia teachers are said to be "very positive — general comment is that these classes are the most rewarding to teach."

When asked whether students use the heritage language outside the classroom, the Manitoba boards felt they do — to a limited extent — and it varied depending on whether the language is spoken at home or during travel to the home country.

Students' proficiency in English does not appear to suffer. Winnipeg did extensive testing for their review, and found that all heritage language students had "fluent to very fluent aural/oral proficiency in English," thus satisfying parents, heritage language teachers and regular teachers. St. James attributed the lack of difficulty here to the fact that it is generally their highest achievers who choose to pursue the German language.

Two of the boards in Manitoba felt that "the program has helped each child to take pride in his/her own heritage as well as [create] a tolerance of other ethnocultural communities."

Advantages for the heritage language program in Manitoba were:

- pride in one's heritage
- retention of ethno-cultural background
- intergenerational communication
- broadening of learner's perspective
- development and enhancement of heritage language communication skills

- development of cultural awareness
- increased acceptance of Canadian mosaic

The thorough survey done by Winnipeg No. 1 highlighted some disadvantages. "Regular classroom teachers indicate that they feel pressure of additional curriculum overload when time is taken to teach a heritage language." In addition, it was felt that the program is not good for children with academic problems or who lacked facility with languages or had other problems with English. Other problem areas pointed out by Winnipeg No. 1 are contained in the summary of their review, our Appendix D. Other problems in other boards were of a more administrative nature: sharing classrooms, timetabling, class sizes, etc.

SASKATCHEWAN

General Information

Of the eight school boards in Saskatchewan responding to the survey, five indicated that they do not have heritage language programs and three do. However, the literature one board provided indicates that part of their second language programs appear to fall within the definition of heritage language. The program in Ukrainian offered by one school board — the Saskatoon Board of Education — will therefore be considered as a heritage language program.

Both the public and Roman Catholic boards in Regina and Saskatoon offer Ukrainian programs, initiated in 1978 or 1979 at parental request.

The Saskatoon Board of Education, in addition to one class in Ukrainian at grades 7-8, has funded, since 1986, the services of a teacher to work as a heritage language program co-ordinator with the Saskatoon Multicultural Council. The objective of the program co-ordinator is to improve the level of instruction offered by the 72 instructors of the Saskatoon Multilingual School to its 700 students from 21 cultural groups. All of these language classes are taught after the regular school day, at nights and on weekends in two schools which the board makes available at no cost. The board also provides the space for a multilingual resource centre.

The Saskatoon Roman Catholic Separate School Division offers Ukrainian at one elementary school where class size ranges from 26 in kindergarten to nine in grade 8. The program continues through secondary school where grades 9 and 10 are offered and grade 11 is planned for 1990-91. The secondary school program consists of two credits.

Regina public schools teach Ukrainian at one central location. It is run as a withdrawal program - students attend one afternoon per week and total enrolment is about 40. The Regina Roman Catholic Separate School Division has a total of 88 students in Ukrainian classes in two schools.

Students

The boards all indicate that numbers have been consistently high since the beginning of the program, and they have a high retention rate. The Regina Roman Catholic board surveyed to determine interest in offering German but it was insufficient. No boards are planning expansion of the heritage language program, nor are there plans to discontinue any language.

The Regina separate board was the only one restricting classes to students of Ukrainian origin. Regina public schools find that "all students have a parent or

grandparent with a Ukrainian ethnic identification," whereas in the Saskatoon separate board "approximately five to ten per cent of the students come from families where neither family is from Ukrainian ancestry."

Programs

No boards in Saskatchewan offer day care or transitional programs in Ukrainian, nor do they offer adult classes. Three boards with classes operate programs during regular school hours. Only the Saskatoon Roman Catholic board operates a "bilingual Ukrainian-English Type B Immersion. Ukrainian is taught all morning in all subjects except English language arts; math and sciences [are taught] in the afternoon." The other two boards allot one afternoon for about 2 1/2 hours a week.

Teaching Staff

All teachers are regular teachers holding Saskatchewan certification and all are native speakers of Ukrainian, although they were not necessarily born in the Ukraine. Professional development opportunities include workshops organized by the Department of Education and by the Saskatchewan Teachers of Ukrainian Special Subject Council and the Saskatchewan Organization of Heritage Languages. In addition, a variety of classes are offered at the University of Saskatchewan's Modern Languages Department.

Classes range in size from 6 - 29. The average is 25 in Saskatoon separate, 15 in Regina separate and nine in Regina public. Teachers in Regina public employ a communicative approach and in the Saskatoon separate board "a thematic approach to language development is used, stressing first the communicative mode, then the listening, reading and writing modes. A holistic approach to language acquisition, with integration of several subject areas when possible, is the basis of the curriculum guide." Both separate boards indicate that other staff in the schools are fluent in Ukrainian.

Community Involvement

Community involvement with heritage language programs is well established in Saskatchewan. The Regina public board has a parents' committee "established to co-ordinate transportation, to provide community support and to publicize the programs." Regina separate also has a parent advisory committee. The Saskatoon separate board draws upon a solid base of community support, including parent volunteers, the Ukrainian Parents' Association, the Parents' Extra-Curricular Committee, the Parents' Supplementary Materials Committee and the Parents' Recruitment Committee, all of which provide moral and financial support. All boards offering Ukrainian heritage language programs incorporate a cultural component.

Administration

Operating funding is a mix of provincial grants and local taxes. The Regina separate board has "some additional sponsoring by the Knights of Columbus" and the Saskatoon separate board benefits from "volunteer parent fund-raising, via the parents' committee."

The Regina separate board is alone in providing additional funding for professional development. The Regina public board is alone in not providing transportation, although they do help in the organization of car pools.

Assessment

Satisfaction with the Ukrainian heritage language programs runs high, as evidenced by the strong retention rates of students. Parents also are very committed to and supportive of the program. The Regina public board notes that, "while some may wish a more comprehensive program, there is recognition that numbers do not warrant a more intensive program." Teachers are also satisfied: Saskatoon separate says "high standards are maintained by staff, who feel a personal and professional need to make the program 'the best'." The Regina separate board admits to "some frustrations trying to cover grades k-8 in three groups." They are also concerned about lack of materials. The sole heritage language teacher with the Regina public board "is pleased with what is accomplished given the time allotment and frequency of classes ...the once a week format is difficult."

Ukrainian is used to a limited degree outside the classroom, primarily in church. None of the boards reported any problems with English language skills in their Ukrainian students: they find that students are fluent in English before they arrive at school, and that they are more mentally adept. Saskatoon separate notes that "by about grade 3 the students are fully bilingual transferring with ease from English to Ukrainian and vice versa. Students have been formally tested in both grade 3 and grade 6 in this regard and test results have proven that English language skills are on track and Ukrainian language skills are progressing well." As for the ability of the heritage language student to master a third language (such as French), the Saskatoon separate board reports: "they have a greater advantage over unilingual students. Students in the bilingual education program need to be taught separately in the French program, because their mastery is far greater, at a more rapid rate."

The heritage language program has had a positive impact on the students' total experience at school, primarily as an affirmation of their cultural identity and also by allowing them to gain knowledge of another language and culture. Other advantages for the heritage language program in Saskatchewan include:

- an enhanced academic program for students
- involvement and support of parents because of the conscious choice of programs and commitment to their youngster's enhanced education
- positive community involvement in school program
- positive social interaction among students who have the same common interests
- affirmation of pride in their cultural identity
- development of a reservoir of people of additional language capabilities
- for society as a whole, increased tolerance and understanding

Disadvantages of the program are that work is missed in the home school program in the case of a "pull-out" program. But this is acknowledged as "not a big problem if the home school teachers co-operate." The Regina public board finds that "regular classroom teachers are able to manage with the students gone half a day per week."

Disadvantages noted by the Saskatoon separate board appear to be minor:

- children wanting to enter the heritage language program past grade 2, who had missed the opportunity previously
- lack of sufficient contemporary materials has put a strain on teaching staff to create their own materials

- lack of funds for publicity and materials for the program

The Regina public board also described heritage language instruction organized and operated by the Multilingual Association of Regina, using two high schools provided by the board at no cost. The board has absorbed extra caretaking and other costs, but a small provincial grant may be made available by the Saskatchewan government. In addition, Saskatchewan Education has recently determined that students may be able to obtain credit standing for courses taken out of school. In the case of heritage languages, students would have to have a certain number of hours of instruction under the direction of a certified teacher and be able to pass a set examination. Currently, one of the Regina public board's courses, German, meets these requirements and the board is seeking to have Saskatchewan Education give it credit status.

The Regina public board also notes that "some rudimentary instruction in Mandarin, Japanese and possibly Korean is to be offered as part of a social science elective on the Pacific Rim" in one secondary school to about 70 students.

ALBERTA

As there is a comprehensive language education policy existing in this province, it is not surprising that the school boards or divisions have had well-established programs in place for some time. Of the 13 school boards responding from Alberta, five currently offer heritage language programs and eight do not.

General Information

Lakeland School District in Bonnyville, Alberta, has been offering Ukrainian for at least the past 20 years. Lethbridge School District No. 51 first offered German in the early 1970s, and was introducing Japanese in 1990. Strathcona County Board of Education, in Sherwood Park, began its program in 1980. The Edmonton Public Schools introduced bilingual programs at staggered dates: Ukrainian, 1973; Hebrew, 1975; Cree, 1978; German, 1979; Mandarin, 1983; and Arabic, 1983. Programs were initiated because of parental demand in Strathcona and Edmonton Public; Strathcona followed up with a survey of all county households. For Lakeland S.D., the large ethnic minority (Ukrainian) warranted the program. Lethbridge attributed their German program to teacher interest, and credited the initiative of one central office administrator with the start-up of the Japanese program.

Lakeland offers Ukrainian "as an 'option' to students in K-9 in one school - enrolment about 50 - and as a high school subject in one high school - enrolment about 30. Numbers at the high school level are declining. Ukrainian was taught at elementary/junior high levels in three district schools prior to about 1985." In Lethbridge public schools, German is taught from grades 4 to 12, in one elementary school, two junior high schools and two senior high schools, and the program size has remained relatively constant, with the addition of the elementary program. The new Japanese program is offered at one senior high school in Lethbridge. In German Bilingual, Strathcona currently has one class in each of the grades from Early Childhood Services to grade 6, where enrolments range from 23 to 8, with an average of 15. Strathcona's Ukrainian Bilingual program, which is much smaller with class sizes of one, three, five and two, is now offered jointly through a tuition agreement with Sherwood Park Catholic.

Edmonton Public Schools run much larger programs. Their total enrolment in Ukrainian Bilingual programs, offered from ECS to grade 9, is now 238 (down from 340

in 1984); in Hebrew Bilingual, offered from ECS to grade 6, it is 216 (up from 194 in 1984); in German Bilingual, offered in ECS through grade 9, students total 303 (up from 202 in 1984); in Chinese Bilingual, offered from ECS to grade 7, there are 302 students (up from 147 in 1984); and for Arabic Bilingual programs in ECS through to grade 7, total enrolment is 332 (up from 108 in 1984).

When asked about plans to offer additional languages in future, Lakeland replied that "Cree has been offered on an occasional basis at one district high school-may be again if demand warrants." Lethbridge speaks of introducing Blackfoot. Strathcona indicates that its plans are "dependent on outcomes of strategic planning initiatives accepted by the board," and speaks of a survey "to establish community support/needs for particular languages, e.g., Japanese, Russian, and Spanish." Edmonton Public does not foresee the addition of new languages to their program. No boards had discontinued any languages, nor were there plans to do so.

Students

None of the four boards responding restricts heritage language classes to students of that particular ethnic group, and estimates of the rate of participation of students from other backgrounds range from 5% to 30%.

Adult classes are offered by some Alberta boards. Strathcona indicated that they have offered German, Ukrainian and Spanish in the past through Continuing Education. Edmonton Public Schools have a very large and active adult program offering the following: Arabic, Cantonese (Level I and II), Mandarin, Cree (Level I and II), Danish, Dutch (Level I and II), German (3 levels), Greek (2 levels), Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian (3 levels), Japanese (2 levels), Norwegian (2 levels), Polish (2 levels), Portuguese (2 levels), Russian (2 levels), Spanish (3 levels), Swedish (2 levels), and Ukrainian (2 levels). This program is offered evenings and Saturdays, in classes of two to two and one-half hours each. The minimum class size is eight, the maximum is 16, and the average is 12.

Programs

Lakeland and Lethbridge do not teach other subjects of the regular curriculum in the heritage language. For Lethbridge, the heritage language instruction is considered enrichment at the elementary level and an option at the secondary level. For both Strathcona and Edmonton Public, the bilingual programs are part of the regular curriculum. For Strathcona, at the elementary level, the heritage language is used for target language arts, social studies, physical education, health and music.

In most cases, the heritage language is taught as part of the regular school day. For Lakeland, at the elementary and junior levels, about 100 minutes per week is allocated to heritage language, and high school has 25 hours per credit. Lethbridge teaches German for 90 minutes per week at the elementary level, for 80 hours a year at the junior high level, and for 125 hours per year at senior high. Strathcona uses the regular day and the partial immersion model: 50% of the school day or year is allotted to heritage languages, as limited by the provincial *School Act*. Edmonton's bilingual programs are considered part of the regular school day; kindergarten is 100% heritage language; grades 1 to 6, 50%; grades 7 to 9, 150 hours per year; and for grades 7 to 9, Ukrainian and German are taught for 50% of the time.

Teaching Staff

The elementary and secondary programs run by the four boards that responded to the survey all use only regular teachers holding Alberta certification to teach their

heritage language programs, and most of these are native speakers of the language. Professional development oportunities include in-service offered by Alberta Education, central office support through the supervisor of second languages, in-school and system professional development days, the teachers' institute and convention, and the specialist council.

Methods of instruction used are those of immersion for the elementary programs in Strathcona, while their senior high program moves towards an integrated communicative approach. Edmonton Public Schools use a variety of methods, as the district does not mandate or promote any single approach or methodology. For their adult classes, the focus is on oral skills; tapes and exercises use day-to-day language and situations.

Whereas Lakeland relies on the provincial curriculum materials, Lethbridge has developed curriculum plans at each level, Strathcona has produced some teaching materials in German, and Edmonton Public has established extensive sets of learning outcomes for grades 3,6, 9 and 12, for languages other than English.

Edmonton Public was the sole board in Alberta reporting that other staff in the school are fluent in the heritage language.

Community Involvement

Community involvement in Alberta's heritage language programs appears to be extensive. Lakeland reports that "the two major teachers of Ukrainian are also heavily involved in the cultural community. Students participate in visits to cultural events, centres, have guest speakers and performers, etc. The high school students have, on occasion, travelled to the Ukraine." Lethbridge makes some use of community resource people, cultural centres and volunteers. In the Strathcona public system, "parent support groups provide a variety of assistance - purchase of additional resources, support of additional aide time, and support of additional class excursions." Edmonton Public Schools also indicate that "schools identify and use community resources as appropriate. Involvement is extensive." As for community input into the curriculum of the heritage language classes, three boards report that it is very limited and informal, but Edmonton Public Schools say that "all district developed curriculum is reviewed by the community." All four responding boards offer a cultural component to their heritage language classes. In the Edmonton public system, the thoroughly prepared *Learning Outcomes for Languages other than English* include two cultural categories: Students Respond to Literature and Other Art Forms, and Students Appreciate and Participate in the Culture. Activities include the production of a multicultural calendar, a tour of Chinatown, a Christmas party for elders and participation in traditional celebrations. The Edmonton public adult classes also make a conscious tie between the cooking and crafts and the language classes.

Administration

Sources of operating funding for Alberta school boards' heritage language programs include the regular provincial and local funding sources. In the Edmonton public board, parents are involved in fund raising for enrichment activities and pay the full cost of transportation. No boards receive special funding for professional development in heritage language. Lakeland and Strathcona provide transportation for these classes; in Edmonton public, transportation is administered by the district but paid for by the parents (monthly fees: $31 for the first child, $30 for the second, and $24 for third and each subsequent child).

Assessment

All involved in Alberta's heritage language programs register strong levels of satisfaction. Strathcona cites the students' "satisfaction and positive pleasure in being able to use another language" and the parents' "satisfaction in spite of challenges of student transportation, publicity and recruitment of students, fund raising, and limited educational/instructional resources," but also notes the teachers' point of view: "Some dissatisfaction with workload in comparison with the English program. Nevertheless, teachers are extremely dedicated to the program and morale is high."

When asked whether the students use the heritage language outside the classroom, most reported it was limited. Strathcona cited "as much as can be expected in the circumstances of being in a dual-track school." Edmonton found that "use varies with the individual student."

Lethbridge found "a good transfer of knowledge" between the heritage language and English, but Strathcona has "found instances of confusion and transfer. On the whole, students in the language programs score above provincial and system average on provincial English Language Arts achievement tests." Edmonton Public, however, has "no district measures of target language achievement by which to make comparisons with English achievement." Similarly, Edmonton has no data to support any conclusion on the question of mastering a third language. The supervisor of second languages for Strathcona gave a detailed response: "From personal teaching experience, I have found students in the Ukrainian bilingual program who begin Core French at grade 4 to be very receptive to the new language and quickly develop communicative fluency appropriate to their development stage in life."

Although it was generally found that the heritage language programs had a positive effect on the students' total experience at school, Strathcona did draw attention to the fact that "some negative experiences have occurred when students leave the bilingual program to continue in grade 7 with the regular program."

Major advantages were seen to be the promotion of language development and tolerance and understanding, and cultural and linguistic retention and appreciation. Difficulties included the expected scheduling and potential staffing difficulties, but prompted this response from Strathcona: "Has caused the majority of the community to come face to face with 'the exotic'. Potential for community polarization exists."

TEACHER TRAINING IN HERITAGE LANGUAGES

THE NUMEROUS FACULTIES OF EDUCATION in Canadian universities offer a diversity of programs in first and second language learning, some of which would certainly be considered relevant to the teaching of heritage languages. Several faculties offer specialized programs in Native education, which may include the teaching of Native languages. These include Lakehead University in Thunder Bay, Ontario, Brandon University in Brandon, Manitoba, and Nipissing University College, an affiliate of Laurentian University, in North Bay, Ontario.

Three universities offer programs which are designed with heritage language teaching in mind, the Universities of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

The University of Manitoba offers four electives in Heritage Language teaching within their B.Ed. degree program. Students from the Post-Baccalaureate certificate in Education program (a professional development program) are also eligible to enrol in them. These courses are:

Principles of Heritage Language Instruction

This course aims to familiarize students with basic principles of heritage language learning at the elementary level. Its concerns are techniques and proce-

dures, and cultural aspects. It aims to develop knowledge and skills in many areas of heritage language teaching, including principles of language (oral and written) and multicultural development, principles and procedures of language teaching methodologies, lesson planning, materials development, teaching techniques and strategies, and language evaluation.

Curriculum and Instruction in Heritage Languages

A study of curriculum, instructional approaches, and techniques relevant to secondary heritage language education. Learning intents are similar to those of the preceding course.

Heritage Language Materials

An evaluation of some current HL instructional materials form the basis for students to develop support materials and to pilot them. The course intends to have students be aware of HL support materials; to evaluate HL instructional materials based on principles of language acquisition, and to suggest appropriate support materials; to produce pedagogically sound support materials for teaching a heritage language; and to use support materials in appropriate ways.

Heritage Language Student Teaching

Practical teaching experience in the schools is carried out under the guidance and supervision of staff members and co-operating teachers. Student teaching is closely integrated with the study of curriculum and methods of instruction at the appropriate level.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

The College of Education, at the University of Saskatchewan, in Saskatoon, offers a new Certificate in Methods of Teaching Heritage Languages, through their Extension Division, in conjunction with the Saskatoon Multicultural Council. This program is meant to improve the professional qualifications of teachers of these courses, enhance the teaching of heritage languages in out-of-school settings, encourage teachers to seek further training, and enhance the status of the teaching of heritage languages in Saskatchewan, perhaps encouraging the recognition of these languages for high school credit. This certificate of proficiency is a University of Saskatchewan certificate only, and does not provide students with official credentials to apply for a teaching position in the provincial school system, nor are the courses atuomatically transferable to a B. Ed. program.

The College of Education has proposed a new course, *Methods of Teaching Modern (Heritage and Trade) Languages*. It will cover various approaches, including structural, functional and interactional. Other areas touched upon include behaviourism and learning vs. acquisition. The method and syllabus design component covers selection and organization of language content, learning tasks and teaching activities, as well as the roles of learners, teachers and instructional materials including testing. Students will examine the various methods of language teaching including Grammar Translation, Direct, Reading, Audiolingual, Communicative Language Teaching, Total Physical Response, and The Silent Way. Other related topics are attitude and motivation, bilingualism, and language and culture.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Within the Department of Language Education, the University of British Columbia offers two courses called Curriculum and Instruction, but all together in one class. In the fall of 1990, this class consisted of six German specialists, seven Spanish specialists, two Italian specialists, one Chinese specialist and one Japanese specialist. Since this class cannot be conducted in the target languages, a kind of generic methodology is used, including many ideas applicable to, and inspired by, ESL methodology. Much of the class time is spent in students teaching each other in their various languages, where everyone finds that they get the most accurate feedback when trying to teach those who know nothing of their language.

SOME TEXTBOOKS USED

Boyer, L. Joan. *Heritage Language Curriculum Guide.* Regina, Saskatchewan: Culture and Recreation, Arts and Multicultural Branch, 1984. 252 p.

Krashen, Steven D., & Terrell, Tracy D. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom.* Hayward, Cal.: The Alemany Press, 1983.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986. 142 p.

Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Savignon, Sandra. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1983.

CONCLUSION

HALF OF THE PROVINCES in Canada, that is, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, support heritage language programs, some to a greater extent than others. Also noted is the fact that British Columbia is in the process of developing some policies and guidelines for similar programs. One or two areas of the country indicated that they are remaining open to community requests, and if sufficient demand arises, a program will be investigated. However the CEA survey also turned up other regions of the country where school administrators doubt that the interest for such programs will ever be found, given the unilingual nature of the community, whether it be French or English.

Corresponding involvement by school boards depends, to a large extent, on the underlying legislation, policies, programs and funding developed by the ministry or department of education in each province. Board programs range from the smallest (one class in one heritage language) to the large programs of over 10,000 students seen in Metropolitan Toronto.

Heritage language programs of instruction across the country appear to be a fairly recent phenomenon, in some cases arising in the '60s or '70s, and some are still developing in 1990. Virtually every language in the world is taught somewhere in Canada. The most common languages in the Prairie provinces are Ukrainian and German, while in Ontario and Quebec, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish and Chinese account for the majority of students.

Scheduling varies from province to province; some boards call heritage language programs a normal part of their day, others use a bilingual format, and still others restrict it to Continuing Education. Timetabling also runs the gamut from early morning, noon-hour, after school, weekends, and classes integrated into the regular school day. Total weekly time allotted to heritage language programs varies greatly, depending both on provincial legislation and local board policies. With few exceptions, the heritage language programs are offered only in the elementary grades.

Satisfaction with the heritage language programs runs high in almost every school board surveyed. For some boards, their teachers find the greatest satisfaction

with this one program. Parents and students generally are also very happy with the program, and numerous advantages are cited. These include:

- positive attitude and pride in one's self and one's background
- better integration of the child into school and society
- increased acceptance and tolerance of other peoples and cultures
- increased cognitive and affective development
- facility in learning other languages
- increased job opportunities
- stronger links between parent and school
- ability to meet community needs

When asked about language skills of students in the heritage language programs, the boards generally felt that learning one language increased their students' ability to learn others. Testing had indicated that heritage language students' skills in English and in French were equal to if not better than those of students not in the heritage language programs.

Disadvantages were far fewer. Most boards mentioned primarily administrative difficulties connected to scheduling, classroom space, class size, etc. Some boards mentioned that, with the withdrawal programs, some regular classroom work was missed, one cause of mixed feelings about the program among regular classroom teachers. And, as the programs are fairly new, shortages of appropriate teaching materials in the target language were noted.

Community involvement is fairly well developed in the heritage language programs: many schools have parent committees to assist in special events, arts and crafts, and, to a lesser extent, teacher selection and development of the curriculum. Almost all boards with heritage language programs include in their classes a cultural component, frequently reflecting the religious holidays, cooking, crafts, dance, etc.

Thus, it would appear that, without commenting on the political questions of ethnic languages and multiculturalism, for the many school boards who offer heritage languages, the advantages for the program outweigh the disadvantages, and the students are increasing their knowledge of language and culture.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
LIST OF RESPONDING SCHOOL BOARDS 51

APPENDIX B
BURNABY SCHOOL DISTRICT
POSITION PAPER ON LANGUAGES 54

APPENDIX C
SEVEN OAKS SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 10
HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS 56
EXTRA-CURRICULAR YIDDISH PROGRAM 58

APPENDIX D
THE WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 1
HERITAGE LANGUAGE REVIEW
EVALUATION REPORT:
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 60

APPENDIX E
PEEL BOARD OF EDUCATION
HERITAGE LANGUAGE: LIAISON INFORMATION 63

APPENDIX A: LIST OF RESPONDING SCHOOL BOARDS

(School Boards with Programs in Heritage Language Are in Bold Type)

Northwest Territories

Yellowknife Education District #1

Newfoundland and Labrador

Gander, Terra Nova Cape Freels Integrated School Board
Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador East Integrated School Board
Labrador City, Labrador West Integrated School Board
Port aux Basques, Port aux Basques Integrated School Board

Prince Edward Island

Charlottetown, Regional Administrative School Unit Number Three
Elmsdale, Regional Administrative School Unit Number One
Montague, Regional Administrative School Unit Number Four
Summerside, Regional Administrative School Unit Number Two

Nova Scotia

Dartmouth District School Board, Dartmouth
Guysborough County District School Board, Guysborough
Halifax County - Bedford District School Board, Halifax County
Halifax District School Board, Halifax
Shelburne County District School Board, Barrington Passage

New Brunswick

Bathurst, Commission scolaire Jérôme-Boudreau No. 41
Dalhousie, School District #36
Grand Falls, Board of School Trustees #50
Grand-Sault, Conseil scolaire #32
Moncton, School District #15
Oromocto, School District # 25
Sackville, School District #14
Saint John, School District #20
St. Stephen, School District #22/23
Woodstock, School District #28/29

Quebec

Ancienne-Lorette, Commission scolaire Ancienne-Lorette
Beaconsfield, Lakeshore School Board

Brossard, Commission scolaire de Brossard
Charlesbourg, Commission scolaire des îlets
Granby, Commission scolaire des Cantons
Montreal, Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal
Montréal, Conseil scolaire de l'île de Montréal
Montreal, Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal
Pointe-Claire, Commission scolaire Baldwin-Cartier
Québec, Commission des écoles catholiques de Québec
Ville St-Georges, Beauce, Commission scolaire régionale de la Chaudière

Ontario

Aurora, York Region Board of Education
Belleville, Hastings-Prince Edward County RCSS Board
Brockville, Leeds and Grenville County Board of Education
Cornwall, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry County Board of Education
Dryden Board of Education
Etobicoke Board of Education
Guelph, Wellington County Board of Education
Hamilton Board of Education
London Board of Education
Mississauga, Peel Board of Education
North York Board of Education
Ottawa Board of Education
Pembroke, Renfrew County RCSS Board
Sarnia, Lambton County Board of Education
Scarborough Board of Education
Thunder Bay, Lakehead Board of Education
Timmins District RCSS Board
Toronto, East York Board of Education
Toronto, Board of Education for the City of York
Toronto Board of Education
Toronto, Metropolitan Separate School Board
Toronto, Metropolitan Toronto School Board
Windsor RCSS Board

Manitoba

Brandon School Division No. 40
Flin Flon School Division No. 46
Winkler, Garden Valley School Division No. 26
Winnipeg, Assiniboine South School Division No. 3
Winnipeg, Seven Oaks School Division No. 10
Winnipeg, St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2
Winnipeg, School Division No. 1

Saskatchewan

Kindersley School Division No. 34
Moose Jaw School Division No. 1
Nipawin School Division No. 61
Prince Albert Comprehensive High School Board

Regina Roman Catholic Separate School Division No. 81
Regina School Division No. 4
Saskatoon Roman Catholic Separate School Division No. 20
Saskatoon School Division No. 13

Alberta

Bonnyville, Lakeland Public School District No. 5460
Calgary Board of Education
Edmonton Catholic School Board
Edmonton Public School Board
Fort McMurray Catholic School Division No. 32
Jasper School District No. 3063
Lethbridge Catholic Separate School District No. 9
Lethbridge School District No. 51
Morinville, Sturgeon School Division No. 24
Peace River School Division No. 10
Red Deer Public School District No. 104
Sherwood Park, Strathcona County Board of Education
St. Albert School District No. 3

British Columbia

Burnaby, Burnaby School District #41
Coquitlam, Coquitlam School District #43
North Vancouver, School District #44 (North Vancouver)
Parksville, School District #69 (Qualicum)
Powell River, School District #47 (Powell River)
Prince Rupert, School District #52
Surrey, School District #36 (Surrey)
Vancouver School Board
West Vancouver, School District #45 (West Vancouver)

APPENDIX B: BURNABY SCHOOL DISTRICT POSITION PAPER ON LANGUAGES

Recognizing that language is a critical and integral component of culture, the school district takes the position:

THAT:

1. Mastery and competence in English is basic to K-12 education.
2. Multi-lingualism is a valuable attribute and a desirable educational objective.
3. The opportunity to become bilingual in English and French shall be available to students in Burnaby.
4. The retention of heritage languages is a positive and desirable undertaking.

In regard to these positions taken by the Board, the school district is committed to undertakings in languages as follows:

1. English

All subjects and required components in the B.C. K-12 program will be offered in English with emphasis upon high standards of mastery and communication.

2. Multi-lingualism

The school district will develop and maintain programs, to the extent that resources allow, in those languages which are basic to the traditional origins of our culture and to the international and economic communities of which we are a part.

The development of programs in these languages will be based upon principles of quality of instruction, assurance of continuity and sufficient participation. Recognition for credit by accrediting agencies and institutions will be a factor. The composition of these language programs will be by and large multicultural and not ethnically homogeneous.

In addition to English and French, the district is committed to offering German, Italian, and Spanish as well as Japanese and Mandarin. These offerings at the secondary school level represent a response to two major lingual/economic communities (EEC, PAC-RIM) which are important to education in B.C.

3. Constitutional Bilingualism

Burnaby has benefited from the evolution of a stable program which enables students to opt for French language instruction.

While conditions have varied over the years, the district has pursued an objective of offering Elementary French as a Second Language (EFSL). This program is sensitive to a supply of qualified teachers, which in turn affects the extent and nature of student participation and enthusiasm.

The district is currently committed to a dual-track French Immersion Program which has grown from one centre to four, having developed on the basis of Board response to participation and demand. A small late Immersion Program beginning at Grade 6 is in its fourth year.

4. *Heritage Languages*

Recognizing the rich contribution of ethno-cultural and linguistic diversity, the district is supportive of heritage language initiatives as a co-curricular adjunct to the schools.

Sensitive to inadvertently contributing to "tribalization" with the potential for abrasion and conflict, the Board is committed to assisting in the development of a multicultural heritage languages program which operates after regular school hours and on Saturdays - sometimes in school facilities.

Summary

The philosophic basis of the Burnaby School District's languages program is that we are one Canadian community, composed of multiple cultural groups, each of which has a role in becoming a part of a richer whole by maintaining and enhancing the unique linguistic heritage of each culture. Essentially, the four basic threads of the lingual-cultural fabric are: (1) English language competency, (2) an opportunity for multi-lingualism, (3) opportunity for constitutional bilingualism, and (4) support in the retention of heritage languages in the community. The goal is a "strong close knit lingual tweed" rather than a harsh cultural checkerboard with separate "ethnic blocks."

1990-02-27

APPENDIX C: SEVEN OAKS SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 10

HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

The Seven Oaks School Division recognizes its responsibility in our community to provide, under certain conditions, instruction in languages other than English or French. The following guidelines form a basis for a comprehensive approach to such instruction in Seven Oaks School Division.

A. General Guidelines

The goals and objectives of the school division for the maximum development of every student must be the main focus of all language programs. As such:

1. Programs will be provided only in situations where a high level of education can be maintained;
2. Programs will be open to all students who qualify for entry points as established by this policy;
3. Programs will be made available as outlined in legislation or as the Board determines;
4. Programs will be provided only where numbers of students warrant development of a viable, comprehensive, ongoing program;
5. Students will not, other than in exceptional circumstances, be displaced from their designated community school by a language program; students who enrol in language programs may need to attend school outside their communities to ensure necessary numbers.

B. Modes of Instruction

Depending on the mode of instruction deemed to be most desirable to meet divisional and language program objectives, the following organizational models will be employed as indicated.

1. Heritage Language - English Bilingual:

(a) K-6 - A minimum of 50% instruction in the heritage language;

(b) 7-12 - Heritage Language Arts option as numbers warrant;

(c) Entry Point - Kindergarten and/or Grade 1.

2. After School Heritage Language:

(a) Any request for a Heritage Language Program must include a petition with signatures of Seven Oaks residents representing at least 15 school-age children in total;

(b) Upon receipt of such request a survey to determine further level of interest will be conducted;

(c) The standard procedure will be to operate classes conducted by the Division at age appropriate levels of instruction;
(d) No class at a given age grouping will begin unless there is registration of ten children;
(e) Classes will operate a minimum of two days per week (45 - 60 minutes per day);
(f) Attendance will be evaluated during the school year (end of January) and re-evaluated each Fall. Should regular attendance in a class fall below the required minimum, that class may be terminated;
(g) Parents with children in a Heritage Language Program will be informed of this policy.

3. ***Language Examination for Special Credit:***

(a) 10 - 12 - As outlined in Administrative and Department of Education guidelines;
(b) Entry point - By application as per guidelines.

C. *Teacher Qualifications and Development*

1. Heritage language teachers must be fluently bilingual.
2. Bilingual substitutes must be employed whenever possible.
3. Language teachers will receive additional professional upgrading as deemed desirable and appropriate by the teacher, the administrator and the Superintendents' Department.

D. *Funding*

1. Where a language program is approved as per legislation, Departmental funds, where provided, will be designated toward that program.
2. Where a language program is approved by the Board of Trustees, establishment and developmental funds will be provided.

E. *Student and Program Evaluation*

1. Reporting to parents on student progress will be in English.
2. All language programs must be regularly monitored and evaluated (a minimum of every three years).

F. *Related Cultural Enrichment*

1. The administrator and teachers of a school will determine the extent to which special culturally-related experiences can and will be incorporated into language programs.

G. *Other Issues*

All residents of Seven Oaks School Division will be informed of all developments in the area of language instruction.

SEVEN OAKS SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 10

EXTRA-CURRICULAR YIDDISH PROGRAM

The following is a recommended initial curriculum in the Yiddish language developed as an extra-curriculum program for two one-hour classes per week in the Seven Oaks School Division. The emphasis of the program is on oral comprehension and expression with reading and writing incorporated after students have developed sufficient confidence and ability in the oral skills.

Goals and Objectives

The focus of this curriculum is to develop the student's ability to understand, speak, read and write in the Yiddish language and to appreciate the cultural contributions made by this language to the life of the Jewish people. In general these goals and objectives are:

1. To emphasize understanding and speaking in the Yiddish language so that students will be able to participate in learning a living language.
2. To make students aware of the contribution the Yiddish language has made to the cultural life of the Jewish people for over one thousand years of Jewish history.
3. To have students develop skills in reading and writing.
4. To have students use skills in reading and writing in discovering the wealth of literature available in Yiddish.
5. To enhance the student's self-esteem and the worth of one's heritage and cultural values through the literature and other materials chosen by the teacher.

Since the curriculum emphasizes speaking and understanding, especially at the outset, teachers need materials that encourage and motivate student participation. These materials should include pictures, flash cards, games, songs, poems and stories.

Curriculum Content

The curriculum content is based on a number of themes which can be used at suitable times of the year and expanded upon to respond to the progress of the students. The suggested themes are:

1. Holidays and Israel.
   Jewish ethics, values, and cultural activities can be introduced and discussed as the different holidays occur. Vocabulary should develop from a few simple words to thoughts and understandings of the significance of each holiday. (Expectations will vary according to the age of the student.)
2. The Calendar.
   Days of the week, months, seasons, the weather, the clock.
3. Numbers - ordinal and cardinal.
4. Colours.
5. Family members - Yiddish and Hebrew names.
6. Homes - rooms, furniture and so on.

7. Clothing - winter, summer, and so on.
8. Food - names of everyday foods.
9. School.
   Items found in the classroom and names of other students.
10. Animals - pets and others.
11. Greetings - good day, good evening, hello, and so on.
12. Jewish-Hebrew words with correct pronunciation.

Grammar

Formal drill is not recommended in the beginning stages of the program (as an example, the conjugating of verbs) but emphasis should be laid upon correct pronunciation and accent and proper use of articles, tenses, and order in sentences. The right to left reading and writing pattern must be stressed from the beginning. Past and future tenses in verbs should be introduced only when and as they occur in the learning materials.

Grammatical areas to be introduced by the teacher:

1. Nouns and Pronouns - singular, plural, possessives.
2. Interrogative forms.
3. Prepositions.
4. Synonyms and Antonyms.
5. Comparatives.
6 Diminutives.
7. Adjectives - agreement in gender, singular or plural.
8. Verbs - action verbs and to be, to have.

APPENDIX D: THE WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 1

HERITAGE LANGUAGE REVIEW EVALUATION REPORT: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

October 1989

The heritage language programs offered in Winnipeg School Division No. 1's elementary schools on a withdrawal basis were evaluated during the 1987-88 school year. This report presents the results and conclusions of the evaluation. The evaluation of the heritage language program examined four main issues: (1) were the original goals and objectives being met, (2) what was the impact of offering the program during the school day, (3) what was the linguistic competency of the children, and (4) were enrolments and class sizes consistent with Division policy?

Information was gathered from surveys, from rating of students' language, and from enrolment figures. heritage language teachers (12), classroom teachers who had students attending heritage language classes (107), principals of schools that had heritage language programs (11), parents of children enrolled in heritage language classes (465), and the grade 4 to 6 children taking heritage language classes (334) were surveyed. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of people responding to the surveys.

The Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) was used to assess students' heritage language and English proficiency. A random sample of 20% of the students in each of the five language programs was assessed. Their heritage language proficiency was rated by their heritage language teacher, and their proficiency in English was rated by their classroom teacher.

Results

There were no goals and objectives stated formally by Manitoba Education when the heritage language programs were originally established in the Winnipeg School Division in 1970. Manitoba Education has since developed a curriculum with goals and objectives for four of the five heritage language programs. The curriculum for Mandarin is currently being finalized. Generally, the goals and objectives focused on developing language skills in the heritage language, and developing an awareness and understanding of the target cultural group. The heritage language teachers considered the main objectives of the program to be the development of listening and speaking skills in the heritage language, and the development of cultural appreciation. There appears to be agreement among the heritage language teachers as to what the goals and objectives of the heritage language program are. As well, principals and heritage language teachers felt the goals and objectives of the program were being met.

There were two main points of view on whether heritage language classes should be held during the school day. Parents and heritage language teachers felt the program should be held during the school day, while the majority of principals and classroom teachers felt it should be held outside the regular day.

From their general comments, most parents appreciated the heritage language programs and liked having the program offered during the school day. Almost 40% of the parents said they would not be willing to send their child(ren) to heritage language classes if they were offered outside of school hours. Anecdotal evidence suggests that parents and heritage language teachers feel that offering the heritage language

programs during the school day gives the programs more status within the school and within the community.

Principals and classroom teachers were against having the heritage language classes during the school day for a number of reasons. They felt that it was potentially disruptive to the classes to have some children leave for 20 to 40 minutes. However, teachers were more likely to cite positive effects for their remaining students when larger groups rather than smaller groups of children left from the class. They tended to use the time for individual attention, extra help, or practice time for the remaining students. Most teachers felt it was a problem for the children attending heritage language classes to catch up on work they missed. Most teachers said their students were missing other academic work while attending heritage language classes.

The children's oral proficiency in both the heritage language and English was assessed. The results indicated that the heritage language proficiency for the children varied depending on the children's language background. The children who were rated as more proficient already spoke the language when they began the program, and/or were spoken to in the heritage language regularly at home. The children who were entering the program with no previous exposure to the heritage language were acquiring some proficiency in the language, but certainly not to the same level as those who spoke the language in the home. In general, the English oral proficiency of all the children was good to very good regardless of which heritage language they were taking.

It was evident from the results that some schools were having difficulty establishing classes that were large enough to meet the minimum class size requirement. In some cases children from four grade levels would have to be combined to form one heritage language class and even then the numbers were small. Some of the heritage language teachers said that combining children from a number of grade levels had a negative impact on their teaching. If principals are forced to combine a number of grade levels, they may be putting their heritage language teachers at a disadvantage.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the evaluation, the following conclusions were made:

1. There is a perception among the heritage language teachers and the principals that the goals and objectives of the heritage language program are being met. There is a greater emphasis on listening and speaking than on reading and writing in the heritage language. There appear to be two different groups of children who attend heritage language classes - those who are very proficient orally because of family background, and those who are less orally proficient. The Division might consider emphasizing the reading and writing component for those heritage language programs where children have attained greater oral proficiency.

2. There were two distinct points of view as to when the heritage language classes should be held. Parents and heritage language teachers felt the program should be held during the school day, but the majority of principals and classroom teachers felt it should be held outside the regular day. There are advantages and disadvantages to both positions, and no conclusion could be reached on which one was the best.

3. The children's oral proficiency in the heritage language varied with the child's language background. Those children who were more proficient were more likely to speak the language before entering the Division's heritage language program, and to use the language in everyday situations outside of school. The children entering the program with no or minimal exposure to the heritage language were acquiring a relatively limited proficiency in the language. This should not be surprising consid-

ering that the children are exposed to the language in school for a period less than two hours a week.

4. Many of the schools are having difficulty meeting the minimum class requirement. At some schools, in order to meet minimum class size, children from two to four grade levels had to be combined in one class. Some teachers felt there was a negative impact, but with the data available it was not possible to determine the full impact this had on students and teachers. This is something that the Division should examine in more detail because it could have implications for the whole heritage language program.

Recommendations

1. That where heritage language programs currently exist, the Board of Trustees continue to offer these progerams within the school day.

2. That the Board of Trustees reduce the required enrolment required to maintain the program from the current number of 18 to 15 per class.

3. That in the future if requests for heritage language programming are received by the Board, discussions be held with the particular ethno-cultural community involved to discuss whether the program would be offered within the school day or immediately after school.

APPENDIX E: PEEL BOARD OF EDUCATION

HERITAGE LANGUAGE LIAISON INFORMATION

WHAT IS A HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAM?

Heritage Language is a program funded by the Ministry of Education to provide instruction for elementary pupils wishing to study a third languge other than English or French.

How is the Program Organized?

The program operates for two and a half hours on Saturdays or Sundays throughout the school year (excluding the school holidays). The Peel Board of Education will register the students, provide administration, classrooms and teachers, supervise the curriculum and evaluate the progress of the program. For reasons of curriculum advantage, languages have been grouped together and offered at specific locations in Peel. Large numbers of students permit instruction at several locations. All courses and locations are conditional upon student enrolment. A minimum of 16 students is required to form a class at any existing location and a minimum of 100 students is required to maintain the operation of any location. Classes may be cancelled or transferred if there is not sufficient enrolment.

What Will be Taught?

The program will be based on the listening, speaking, reading and writing of the language. A cultural component involving folk songs, dances, costumes, etc., will provide the balance of the program.

Who is Eligible to Attend?

Only those students who are currently enrolled in an Ontario *elementary* school are eligible to attend a Heritage Language program. Peel residents will be given first priority. All other applicants will be considered if space is available in any existing class.

When are the Classes Held?

Classes are held throughout the school year, commencing September 23/24, 1989 and terminating on June 9/11, 1990, with the exception of school holidays and vacation periods.

What is the Cost of the Program?

There is no registration fee for the Heritage Language program. Parents are, however, responsible for providing transportation to and from the classes.

Who is Responsible for What?

What is the Role of the Peel Board? In the operation of a Heritage Language program, the Peel Board of Education will work co-operatively with Ethnic Community Associations, assist teachers in the classrooms, design curriculum and sponsor professional development workshops for teachers. The board will register the students, provide administration and classrooms. The selection of teaching staff, determination of the program and supervision of staff and pupils will be done by the co-ordinator appointed by the Continuing Education Department. In selecting staff, preferred criteria will include teacher certification in their own country or in Canada, previous teaching experience and demonstrated understanding of child psychology and children's learning habits.

What is the Role of the Community Association? Where a Community Association exists, consultation concerning program and staffing *may* occur between the board and the representative of the Community Association.

In the area of staffing, the Community Association *may* propose a number of possible staff names in excess of the total number required. The co-ordinator will interview those candidates and select those staff that are most suitable. Teachers of Heritage Language are employees of the Peel Board, and not the association.

Where Heritage Language curriculum does not exist, teachers selected by the co-ordinator should submit a proposed program for the approval of the co-ordinator. This should be done prior to the start of classes for the fall sessions. If a curriculum has been established by the Peel Board, that curriculum will be used.

Any concerns that the Community Association may have regarding any aspects of the program should be expressed to the co-ordinator. Responsibility for supervision of teachers and program is that of the Board and not the parents or the association. Any concerns, however, should be addressed to the co-ordinator and/or the Continuing Education Department.

Payment of Fees

No fees are to be collected from parents for Peel Board Heritage Language programs. Where association fees are required parents should be advised that such fees are not in support of the Peel Board program. This is especially critical during registration.

Extended Classes Operated by Community Associations

Some groups request permission to extend the program beyond the two and a half hour time period given for Heritage Language. All such classes are the responsibility of the association. The Continuing Education Department assumes no responsibility for the supervision of the program or for teachers' salaries in any extended class situation. A representative of the association must apply for a permit for school use to allow them to extend the program.

A permit may be obtained by applying to the area Business Officer.